Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

BIS-SOV-91-138
hursday
8 July 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-138 CONTENTS *18 July 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Officials Comment on START Treaty 1
  - Karpov: Treaty 'Important' *[Moscow Radio]* 1
  - Foreign Ministry Official *[INTERFAX]* 1
- Soviet-U.S. Commission Opens in Geneva *[TASS]* 1
- Delegation in Vienna on Conventional Forces *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Gorbachev Meets With G-7 Leaders in London 2
  - Meets Mitterrand, Kaifu *[TASS]* 2
  - More on Meeting With Mitterrand *[TASS]* 2
  - Further on Mitterrand *[Moscow TV]* 2
  - Improving Relations With Japan *[TASS]* 2
  - Meets Reconstruction Bank President *[TASS]* 3
  - Meets Bush, Discusses Issues *[TASS]* 3
  - Gorbachev-Bush News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 3
  - 'Text' of Gorbachev-Bush Conference *[TASS]* 4
  - Invites Bush to July Moscow Summit *[TASS]* 5
  - Summit Tentatively 30, 31 July *[Moscow Radio]* 5
  - 'Common Victory' With U.S. *[Moscow TV]* 5
  - Meeting With G-7 Leaders Begins *[TASS]* 5
  - Gorbachev: Things 'Going Fine' *[PRAVDA 18 Jul]* 6
  - Gorbachev, Major News Briefing *[Moscow TV]* 6
  - Reportage on News Conference *[TASS]* 12
  - Further on News Conference *[TASS]* 12
  - Meets Press on Talks With G-7 Leaders *[TASS]* 13
  - Meets Andreotti, Mulroney *[Moscow Radio]* 13
  - More on Gorbachev-Andreotti Meeting *[TASS]* 13
  - Mitterrand on Assistance *[TASS]* 14
  - Ignatenko on G-7 Meeting *[TASS]* 14
- Bessmertnykh's London Activities 17 Jul *[TASS]* 14
- Vorontsov Comments on Iraqi Nuclear Program *[TASS]* 15
- Soviet Experts Admit Faults in Nuclear Reactors *[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 16 Jul]* 16
- Preparations for Human Rights Conference *[INTERFAX]* 16
- Black Sea Deputy Foreign Ministers Meet *[TASS]* 16
- Spokesman Reports Irish Foreign Minister's Visit *[TASS]* 17

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

- Japanese POW Leader on Talks with Yanayev *[Moscow International]* 18
- Japan Not Reciprocating Military Concessions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jul]* 18
- Rogachev Interviewed on Recent Visit to Japan *[Moscow International]* 19
- Fisheries Cooperation With DPRK Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 20
  - Further on Fishery Agreement *[Moscow International]* 21
- DPRK's Proposal for ROK Talks Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 21
- South Korea Licensed To Produce F-16 Fighters *[Moscow International]* 22
- Gorbachev, Yeltsin To Meet ROK Opposition *[TASS]* 22

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Agreement Signed With Vietnam on Oil Extraction *[TASS]* 22
Oil Extraction Increases *[TASS]* 23
Moscow Assesses Prospect of Cambodian Solution *[Moscow International]* 23
Maslyukov Departs for Visit to Malaysia *[TASS]* 23
Official Hopes ASEAN Relations Improve *[TASS]* 24
Explosion Reported on Pacific Fleet Vessel *[INTERFAX]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Stolen Uranium on Sale in Maputo, Claims Paper *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 24
Mozambican Minister Issues Denial *[TASS]* 25
Ambassador Korneyev Denies Uranium Stolen *[TASS]* 25
Trade Delegation Arrives in South Africa *[Moscow International]* 26
Mining Agreement Signed With South Africa *[Moscow International]* 26
Health Agreement Signed by USSR, EEC, Niger *[Moscow International]* 26
TASS Correspondents Interview Namibia's Nujoma *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 26
Donskikh-Led Delegation Ends Zimbabwe Visit *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 27
Delegation Head Views Ethiopian Trip *[INTERFAX]* 27
CPSU Secretariat Greets Cape Verde Party Congress *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 27

East Europe

East European Perceptions of G-7 Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 27
Bogomolov on Eastern Europe, Soviet Reforms *[Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 12 Jul]* 28
Reportage on Yugoslavia Conflict *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]* 29
Shevardnadze on UN Role *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 30
Talks Continue on Troop Withdrawal From Poland *[INTERFAX]* 30
Situation After Pullout From CSFR Viewed *[PRAVDA 13 Jul]* 30

West Europe

Report on German Plane Intrusion *[INTERFAX]* 32
Response Lauded *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 32
EC's Delors Discusses Soviet Reform *[Moscow TV]* 32
French Welcome Visiting Warships to Toulon *[Moscow TV]* 33

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Regional Groups Express Right to Union Membership *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 34
Panel Resolution on Employment Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jul]* 34
IZVESTIYA Reports Union Treaty Debate *[13 Jul]* 35

Political & Social

Shevardnadze Views G-7, Yugoslavia, Press *[INTERFAX]* 42
Shevardnadze Interviewed on New Reform Movement *[TRYBUNA 15 Jul]* 43
Well-Known Figures Join Democratic Movement *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]* 44
Popov on Conditional Support for Gorbachev *[Tokyo KYODO]* 44
Ivashko Gives Telephone Interview *[Moscow TV]* 44
Regions Barred From Treaty Plan Own Congress *[INTERFAX]* 51
KGB School Admits TV Film Crew *[Moscow TV]* 51
Kagarlitskiy on Strikes, Workers Movement *[DAGENS NYHETER 13 Jul]* 51
Union Head on Government's Progress on Accord *[TRUD 12 Jul]* 54
TASS Reviews 18 Jul Soviet Central Press 56

Economic

- Primakov Interviewed on Economic Reform *[London TV]* 57
- State Bank Balance Published, Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]* 57
- Dollar Soars Against Ruble on Currency Market *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]* 58
- Foreign Trade Turnover Falls 37 Percent *[INTERFAX]* 59

Agricultural

- CPSU's Stroyev on Agrarian Sector's Plight *[PRAVDA 17 Jul]* 59
- Price Discrepancies Blamed for Sectoral Plight *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 62
- Report Surveys Weather, Crop Conditions *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Jul]* 62

Scientific

- Spaceplane Designers Outline Research Trends *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 63
- Space Official Interviewed on Projects *[Moscow Radio]* 65
- Crimean Solar Energy Institute Boasts Progress *[Moscow TV]* 66

Military

- Southern, Central Groups of Forces Abolished *[Moscow Radio]* 66
- Details of Lost MiG-23 Reported; Pilot Killed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul]* 66
- Several Military, Navy Departments To Disband *[Moscow Radio]* 67
- Military Farms Shown Supplying Naval Vessels *[Moscow TV]* 67

BALTIC REPUBLICS

- Moiseyev Contacts Baltics on Solving Problems *[Radio Vilnius]* 68

Estonia

- Savisaar Discusses 'Worsening Situation' *[BALTFAX]* 68
  - Highway Customs Post Removed *[TASS]* 68
- Sobchak Discusses Narva Free Economic Zone Issue *[Tallinn TV]* 69
- Interregional Council Leader on United Estonia *[Tallinn Radio]* 69

Latvia

- Bomb Explodes at Riga Procuracy Building *[Radio Vilnius]* 69
- Internal Affairs Minister on Relations With USSR *[Riga Radio]* 69
- Latvia To Replace Civil Defense Service *[Moscow Radio]* 70

Lithuania

- Statement Issued to Internal Affairs Officials *[Radio Vilnius]* 70
- Landsbergis Comments on Internal Struggles *[Vilnius International]* 70
- Vilnius OMON Commander Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jul]* 71
- Aims of Lithuanian Opposition Forum Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jul]* 73

RSFSR

- Congress Adjourns Without Electing Chairman *[INTERFAX]* 76
  - Baburin, Khasbulatov View Problems *[Moscow TV]* 76
  - Commentary on Adjournment *[TASS]* 76
- Yeltsin's Priority Political Tasks Listed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jul]* 77
- Polozkov, Other Deputies on State Structure *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 16 Jul]* 78
- Polozkov Meets With Party, Labor Veterans *[SOVETKSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Jul]* 79
- Leningrad Communist Leader on CPSU Disputes *[INTERFAX]* 79
- Sobchak Overrules Soviet on Joint Patrols Issue *[PRAVDA 17 Jul]* 79
- City Soviet Chiefs Back 'Reform Movement' Idea *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 16 Jul]* 79

Silayev Approves Free Economic Zone in Kuzbass *[TASS]* 80
Gidaspov Remarks on Gorbachev Post, Others *[Radio Rossii]* 80
Foreign Minister Kozyrev Arrives in Romania *[TASS]* 80
Democratic Russia Resolution on Armenia, Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 80
Rutskoy To Form Breakaway Party *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jul]* 81

Western Republics

Belorussia

Extra Powers to Government, Premier *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]* 82
Orsha, Trade Union Reach Agreement *[Minsk Radio]* 82
Belorussian, Latvian Firms Sign Contract *[Minsk Radio]* 82
Belorussia, Moldova Establish Economic Agreement *[Minsk Radio]* 82

Ukraine

Export of Agricultural Produce Banned *[Moscow Radio]* 82
Ukraine Communist Party Organizations Abolished *[Kiev International]* 82
Kravchuk Speaks at Independence Celebrations *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]* 83

Moldova

Trade, Industry Chamber Expands Activity *[TASS]* 83
Former Premier Druk on Differences With Snegur *[INTERFAX]* 83

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Labor Minister Gugushvili on Unemployment Policy *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 19 Jun]* ... 84
Gamsakhurdia, Mutalibov Comment on Pact *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 16 Jul]* 86

Armenia

Official Criticizes Azerbaijani 'Propaganda' *[INTERFAX]* 86
Human Rights Commission Travels to NKAO *[INTERFAX]* 86
  Radio Rossii Reports Trip 87
  Rights Abuses Described *[Moscow TV]* 87

Azerbaijan

President Mutalibov on Relations With Armenia *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Second Presidential Candidate Nominated *[TASS]* 88

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

'Serious Changes' to Economic Policy Planned *[TASS]* 89

Tajikistan

Islamic Revival Threatening Republic Government *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jul]* 89

Officials Comment on START Treaty

Karpov: Treaty 'Important'

LD1707163591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1430 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] There is another event that is widely being discussed today in the media. It is the considerable headway made in the last few days in preparing the Soviet-U.S. treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons. Anticipating the signing of this document, many newspapers have already started counting how much and what items the sides will have to reduce. Our commentator, Vladimir Pasko, asked Karpov, one of the leading specialists in the sphere of arms control and USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, about this. Here is what he said:

[Begin Karpov recording] We will reduce warheads from approximately 10,000 to 6,000, while the United States will go from approximately 13,000 to 6,000, they will have to reduce more warheads. Regarding the means of delivery, it is the other way around. We will reduce from 2,400 to 1,600 while the United States will reduce from approximately 2,200 to 1,600. There is a thorough balance of interests, which allows one to say that such parity as has been attained, a strategic parity, will be registered in the treaty and will become a legally based norm of mutual relations between the United States and the USSR. I view the future treaty as important. [end recording]

Foreign Ministry Official

OW1807065691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 17 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Pamorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The problem of the firing weight of missiles, which remains unresolved in the framework of the Strategic Arms Treaty, needs a political solution, despite its largely technical nature. This was an opinion expressed by a disarmament expert from the USA and Canada Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Experts can give their precise recommendations in time for today's (July 17) meeting in London between President Gorbachev and President Bush. However, according to the Soviet expert, the last word should be left to politicians, either presidents or ministers.

In a DP [Diplomatic Panorama] interview a Foreign Ministry representative said that the given problem was only superficially technical and that in fact it should for a range of serious points "concerning the national security of both the USSR and the USA." [sentence as received] It is encouraging to note however, that this problem is not as great as the already settled one on the question of telemetrics. There is, therefore, the possibility that it could be settled quickly, especially on the basis of the experience of agreement on all the other points of the Strategic Arms Treaty.

Soviet-U.S. Commission Opens in Geneva

LD1607191891 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Geneva July 16 TASS—The Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission began its session here today.

The commission was founded in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. memorandum dated December 21, 1972, to promote implementing aims and provisions of Soviet-U.S. agreements on strategic arms reductions and measures to lessen the danger of nuclear war.

Delegation in Vienna on Conventional Forces

LD1707145891 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna July 17 TASS—The fourth round of the new stage of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe ended here today. After a prolonged lull due to difficulties in drafting a treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe, delegations from 22 countries participating in the forum held constructive discussions on the restriction of troop personnel and evolving stabilising measures.

At the closing meeting today, the Soviet delegation submitted a working document on the restriction of personnel of the conventional armed forces in Europe. Experts believe this can make the debate more purposeful and concrete.

The Soviet delegation believes the future arrangement should take fundamental principles into consideration. Personnel reduction should be made on a national basis by each participating state. This approach would reflect the realities of the new Europe and non-bloc nature of the negotiations conducted. This would also make it possible fully to consider national peculiarities of the formation of the armed forces and their training.

The Soviet delegation believes personnel reduction should apply to land troops, air forces and air defence aviation. Reductions should not apply to rocketry strategic forces, the Navy, marines, coastal defences, naval aviation, or troops of the country's anti-aircraft defences and units that ensure internal security.

Reductions will not apply to some other units not in the armed forces, specifically, railway and construction troops.

Gorbachev Meets With G-7 Leaders in London

Meets Mitterrand, Kaifu

LD1707121591 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today began meetings with participants at the annual meeting of heads of the seven leading industrialised countries that has just ended here.

In the morning he met French President Francois Mitterrand and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu. Now he has meetings with U.S. President George Bush.

Gorbachev also had a conversation with Jacques Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, formed expressly for the promotion of reforms in the Soviet Union and in other East European countries.

More on Meeting With Mitterrand

LD1707204191 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand met today at the French president's residence in London. The meeting was marked by traditional friendliness and mutual understanding.

The presidents held an in-depth exchange of views on issues relating to Soviet cooperation with Western industrialised countries with the aim of promoting Soviet reform, its integration into the world economy and, eventually, ways to perfect the entire system of international economic relations.

Gorbachev noted the great significance of Soviet-French cooperation and stressed that the Soviet Union was ready to carry out major joint projects with the Group of Seven countries on the basis of mutual benefit and preservation of the values and identity by all countries involved in this process.

"We are not going to copy anyone's models," the Soviet president said. "We are going along our own path, taking into account the vital interests of our people, and are ready to be an organic part of the world economy observing 'rules of the game'."

Mitterrand reaffirmed complete support for the perestroyka process in the Soviet Union and resolutely supported specific measures taken in the West to promote its success.

The meeting was attended by Roland Dumas, Pierre Beregovoy, A. Lauvergeon, and Pierre Morel from the French side, and by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Yevgeniy Primakov, Vladimir Shcherbakov and Vadim Zagladin from the Soviet side.

Further on Mitterrand

LD1707123791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Jul 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The official part of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Great Britain started with a meeting with French President Mitterrand this morning. This is profoundly symbolic because our countries are linked by traditions of friendship and cooperation. President Mitterrand is one Western leader who has most consistently supported the idea of giving economic assistance to perestroyka in the USSR. During a business lunch, [as heard] in a relaxed atmosphere, leaders of the two countries discussed issues which are of importance both to us and many people in the West: the program for economic reforms which President Gorbachev will present to G7 leaders today, the idea of incorporating the Soviet economy into the world economy, and ways of economic cooperation. [video shows Gorbachev and Mitterrand entering building, posing for cameras; at meal Gorbachev is seated next to Dumas; Shcherbakov, Bessmertnykh, and Primakov also present at the table]

Improving Relations With Japan

LD1707204991 Moscow TASS in English 2011 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu met in London today.

They stated with satisfaction that the development of Soviet-Japanese relations proceeds in the framework of the joint statement and other documents signed at the Tokyo summit in April. The president and the premier exchanged messages. They continued work to draft a peace treaty, including territorial issues, and started discussing some large projects of mutually beneficial economic cooperation, including conversion. There was an upsurge in parliamentary and public relations. There are plans to hold contacts between experts on market economy. Measures are taken to ease contacts between the population of neighbouring regions of the USSR and Japan.

Gorbachev recalled his concept of gradually improving Soviet-Japanese relations, when each new level of trust gives rise to new institutions of cooperation and ever more difficult problems are solved.

In the context of the Group of Seven meeting, Gorbachev set out his vision of organic integration of the Soviet economy into the world system as one of the key aspects of the formation of a new type of international economic relations.

The meeting was held in a good neighbourly atmosphere.

Meets Reconstruction Bank President

LD1707204491 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today received at his residence Jacques Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD].

They held a lively, substantial discussion that focused on further cooperation between the USSR and the EBRD, the bank's participation in the implementation of various specific projects promoting economic reform in the Soviet Union and intensification of its links with the world economy.

The meeting was attended by Ye. Primakov, V. Shcherbakov, and V. Zagladin.

Meets Bush, Discusses Issues

LD1707204791 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met U.S. President George Bush in London early today. The 1 ½ hour meeting focused on the role of and prospects for Soviet-U.S. interaction, which already benefited the modern world, and which continues to be requred by the world community, especially, at the current crucial period.

The two presidents raised in general terms the issue of the forthcoming meeting between Gorbachev and the Group of Seven later in the day.

In the spirit of trust and sincerity, the two leaders exchanged views on the key aspects of their participation in the world politics, specified and reaffirmed their positions on issues that caused controversy in the political and public circles of the two countries.

Having obtained information that their representatives finalized the remaining technical issues of the draft START treaty, the presidents agreed on the date of George Bush's visit to the USSR in the end of July - the beginning of August.

The luncheon was attended by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Vladimir Shcherbakov, Yevgeniy Primakov, A. Chernyayev: James Baker, Nicholas Brady, Brent Scowcroft, and John Sununu.

Gorbachev-Bush News Conference

LD1707195791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By Andrey Ptashnikov]

[Text] As this program goes out on the air, in the old mansion known as Lancaster House, talks are taking place between our president and the presidents of the United States and France, the prime ministers of Britain, Canada, Italy, and Japan, and the chancellor of Germany. The talks have been going on for 2 ½ hours. According to the information available to journalists, they will continue for another hour at least. They are taking place behind closed doors, so we can only guess at the progress. The main topic is the future of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the G-7 countries. That is all I can say for the time being about the main event of the day.

Many other, very important events occurred in London today: At the beginning of the day, the USSR president met separately with French President Mitterrand and Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu. They discussed bilateral relations, mainly ways of broadening economic cooperation. There was also a conversation between Comrade Gorbachev and Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I remind you that that bank was founded this year to promote economic reform in the USSR and the countries of East Europe.

Finally, in the middle of the day, the event took place that had been awaited with particular interest. I am talking about the meeting between the presidents of the USSR and the United States. The expectations were justified, the talks turned out to be very productive. Let the actual participants tell us about it themselves. Here is a recording of the brief news conference by Comrade Gorbachev and George Bush, which they gave immediately after the end of their conversation.

[Begin recording] [Bush, in English, fading to Russian translation] It is a great honor for me to greet President Gorbachev here, in this embassy. We have made a great deal of progress. He may wish to say a few words about that progress. From the point of view of the United States, as far as economic questions and arms limitation are concerned, we are very satisfied with the meeting. Once again, I am very pleased to see you and your leading specialists and colleagues. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] The President was very brief, but that is dictated by the situation. In fact, there was little time at our disposal, but we made good use of it and were able to talk about a lot. But again there is no time for news conferences either, and it is probably only later that you will be able to satisfy your curiosity, at further meetings with us. Nevertheless, I want to say this in connection with the fact that it was reported to us that all questions have been solved in connection with the treaty on strategic offensive weapons. The President and I agreed to conclude everything in Geneva, and we issued, will issue, such instructions so that it is possible to sign that treaty.

In connection with this, the question is solved for the visit of the President of the United States of America to the Soviet Union. I have invited the President to visit us at the end of July, right at the end. I hope that everything is now clear to us, and that such a visit will take place, and the Soviet people, all of us, will be glad to offer hospitality to the President of the United States and, I hope, to his wife, Barbara Bush, and to all the accompanying officials.

[Bush, in English, fading to Russian translation] We have great pleasure in accepting President Gorbachev's invitation. We will be able to do a lot. We have already accomplished much during the talks about the treaty. Our goal, of course, is the economic aim that we should cooperate and work together with President Gorbachev and with the other members of the seven and with other countries of the world so as to integrate the Soviet economy with the world economy. That is a big question, a big project. I promised him our great interest in doing and accomplishing that. Thank you, Mikhail, for the invitation. We accept your invitation.

[Gorbachev] Finally, the President and I will talk within the framework of the discussion that is under way in connection with this unique meeting. We are satisfied with the discussion that took place. [end recording]

In conclusion, I will just say that, immediately after the end of the meeting, which is still going on, between President Gorbachev and the G-7 leaders, a joint news conference is planned with Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Major. At it we will learn how the talks progressed.

'Text' of Gorbachev-Bush Conference

LD1707200591 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—After today's talks in London U.S. President George Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev held a brief joint news conference at Winfield House, the U.S. ambassador's residence in Britain. Follows the text of the news conference:

President Bush: Well, may I say that it was a pleasure to have President Gorbachev in this embassy. We've made a good deal of progress, and we will—he might have something to say about how much progress. But from the standpoint of the United States and the economic front and the arms front, we are very pleased with this meeting.

And once again, Mikhail, welcome, sir. I'm delighted to see you and your top people here.

President Gorbachev: Mr. President, it was very short and that's because of the circumstances. In fact, we didn't have a lot of time at our disposal, but we used it very well and very productively and we were able to talk about quite a few things. Again, there's not much time for the press conference, and maybe later you will be able to satisfy yourselves as far as what happens at our subsequent meeting.

Now, what I want to say was, in view of the fact that we were told that all of the issues are solved on the START treaty, we, with the President of the United States, have agreed to finalize everything in Geneva, and we will give commensurate instructions so that we could then sign that treaty. And this connection—there's also the issue of the visit of the President of the United States to the Soviet Union.

Once again, I've invited the President to come to the Soviet Union on a visit at the very end of July, and I hope that everything is clear now about the visit—the visit will take place. The Soviet people, all of us will be ready to give our hospitality to the President of the United States and, I also hope, to Mrs. Bush, and to all those who will accompany him to Moscow. Welcome, Mr. President, to Moscow and welcome all of you to Moscow.

And the last point, the President and I have had a discussion within the framework of what is happening in the context of this unique meeting with the G-7. And we are pleased with the kind of discussion that has taken place on those issues.

President Bush: May I simply say that we accept with pleasure President Gorbachev's invitation. I hope we can get a lot done. And we've already accomplished a lot in treaty negotiations.

The goal, of course, is an economic goal. We'd be cooperatively working with President Gorbachev and, I would say, the rest of the G-7 and the rest of the world in integrating the Soviet economy into the rest of the world's economies. It's a big problem, a big project, but I pledge to him my interest and our efforts to do just exactly that.

But thank you, Mikhail, for your invitation. And before you change your mind, we accept with pleasure.

President Gorbachev: Well, I think that over the years of our cooperation you have seen, Mr. President, that we are true to our word in all those things: in working together, in accommodating you, your interests and the interests both of ourselves and of our partners, particularly the United States.

I think that we have to say that the President and I have very limited time and so will not be able to answer all the questions that you would like to ask. After the meeting with the G-7, maybe then I will be able to answer all of your questions.

Question: Does this mean you have a START treaty ready to sign now, and you are going to Moscow, and everything is on the line? Who caved? Who gave in?

President Bush: There was compromise on all sides and it's in the best interest of the United States, and I hope that the Soviet people feel it's in the best interest of the Soviet people.

President Gorbachev: Let me say I share what the President has just said. We will not be able to succeed either today or tomorrow in building new international relations, new international security, in achieving a balance of interest in the world if we try to achieve advantage and if we try to win. We have to move reciprocally towards each other in the interests of both our peoples, and I hope very much that the meeting that will take place in Moscow will be in the interest of all mankind, of all those who will be able to now breathe more quietly and to say that we have moved further away from the threat of nuclear war. So it's our common victory.

Question: About G-7, what do you see about the—as the strong position, strong points of the Gorbachev proposal?

President Bush: I think it would be unwise and inhospitable for me to start talking about the G-7 and what might happen to it until Mr. Gorbachev has a chance to come to this meeting hosted by John Major. That's the first point.

Secondly, let me simply say that in terms of our luncheon, I am convinced, as I have been, that President Gorbachev is determined to continue with economic reform. They face difficult problems. I'll be candid with you, we face difficult problems at home in a budgetary sense. But all and all, I would leave anything coming out of the G-7 until after the president has had a chance to discuss this with the other seven leaders.

Question: What's the date—pin it down.

President Bush: Well, we're pinning it down, but I'd say the very end of July.

Question: How long will the summit be?

Answer: President Bush: Oh, two or three days, but that's up to our host."

Invites Bush to July Moscow Summit

LD1707130991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By unnamed correspondent]

[Text] London, 17 Jul (TASS)—In the course of the meeting between USSR President Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush that has just taken place in London, the Soviet leader invited the American leader to visit the Soviet Union at the very end of July. Mikhail Gorbachev stated this here at a joint news conference with George Bush.

The U.S. President stated at the news conference that he accepts this invitation with great pleasure.

Mikhail Gorbachev also stated at the news conference that in principle all the questions relating to the Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive weapons had been resolved in the course of their current meeting in London.

Summit Tentatively 30, 31 July

LD1707154991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The United States and the Soviet Union on Wednesday sealed agreement in principle on a treaty to slash their arsenals of long-range nuclear arms and set a late July summit in Moscow for Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet leader told a joint press conference in London that he and President Bush had decided to give instructions for the finalising of a key START arms treaty in Geneva.

A senior White House official said Gorbachev's reference to instructing negotiators in Geneva to finish the agreement referred to the need for experts to translate the political accord reached by the leaders into a formal treaty language. The last remaining issue dividing the parties concerned the way to define the deal with new missiles under the treaty.

The official also said that the Moscow summit was tentatively set for 30 and 31 July.

'Common Victory' With U.S.

LD1707221291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By V. Zorin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Journalists in London described the Bush-Gorbachev conversation, which lasted 90 minutes, as a minisummit. [passage omitted] [video shows meeting; Bush, Gorbachev statements afterwards]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] We will not succeed, either today or tomorrow, in the construction of new international relations, a new system of security, or a balance of interests if we act toward each other from the position of who is going to force the other to the floor. No, this is a reciprocal movement in the interests of our two great states and peoples. I hope that the event that will take place in Moscow is in the interests of all people so that everyone once again will breathe more easily and think that we have moved even further away from the threat of nuclear war. This is our common victory. I think, on the whole, that all those who have worked to attain such a global solution should be given their due. [end recording]

Meeting With G-7 Leaders Begins

LD1707153391 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—A meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and the heads of state and government of the G-7 industrialised nations has begun at Lancaster House, the British government's official building.

British Prime Minister John Major, U.S. President George Bush, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, French President Francois Mitterrand, Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, President of the European Communities' Commission Jacques Delors and Dutch Prime Minister Rudolph Lubbers, current chairman of the Council of Europe, are attending the meeting.

Gorbachev: Things 'Going Fine'

PM1707222591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[By A. Karpychev, T. Kolesnichenko, and A. Lyutyy report: "Moscow on Thames. Our special correspondents report on the '7 plus 1' Meeting"]

[Excerpts] London—The leaders of the G-7 concluded their meeting on the morning of 17 July, but the USSR president continued it, so to speak, after lunch.

This was not an easy day, especially not for M.S. Gorbachev.

There were so many contacts at the summit level, they could have filled six months in an ordinary diplomatic calendar. It is possible to say that this was "Soviet Day" in London. M.S. Gorbachev either called on various G-7 leaders, or they came to see him at his residence.

But the most important event took place at 1430 hours when the USSR president met with all the G-7 leaders in the Music Room of Lancaster House.

What was the topic of discussion? We will learn the details later, during the news conference to be given by Prime Minister J. Major (host of the G-7 meeting) and President Gorbachev.

Now a few words about another of the day's events which was probably no less important than the present London meeting. I am referring to the meeting between the Presidents of the USSR and the United States. Before they withdrew for talks at the residence of the U.S. ambassador to Britain in Winfield House, we managed a brief conversation with M.S. Gorbachev?

"How is your mood, Mikhail Sergeyevich?"

"Can't you see? I believe it's obvious. Things are going fine."

When G. Bush and M.S. Gorbachev came out to meet the journalists again after talks which lasted 90 minutes it was possible to sense that the mood of both presidents had by no means deteriorated. During this meeting the sides determined how to enter the finishing straight of a treaty limiting strategic offensive arms.

At a brief news conference the USSR president announced that he had invited Bush to visit Moscow at the end of July.

"Before you change your mind, Mikhail, Barbara and I have decided to tell you that we accept your invitation to visit the Soviet Union," Bush said jokingly.

But we are talking about a very important event: One of the most important documents in the history of disarmament has been drawn up. Both president have given instructions to their delegations in Geneva to reach total agreement on all outstanding technical details so that the leaders of the two countries can sign this document in Moscow.

Replying to questions from Soviet journalists, Bush stressed that he is convinced of Gorbachev's sincere commitment to economic and political reforms in the Soviet Union.

For his part M.S. Gorbachev declared:

"I share what the President has said. We will get nowhere, either today or tomorrow, as regards building new international relations, a new security system, and a balance of interests if we proceed from the position—who can wrestle whom to the ground. No, this is a reciprocal movement in the interests of both our great states and peoples, and I hope that what happens in Moscow will meet the interests of all mankind, enabling it to breathe more easily. So that it is our common victory. [passage omitted]

Despite everything, the meeting of the G-7 with M.S. Gorbachev means a great deal. It can be compared with the breakthrough which was achieved in Geneva in 1985. There it was a political breakthrough, and here it may become an economic one. In any case we are already very close to it.

Gorbachev, Major News Briefing

LD1707212891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 17 Jul 91

[News conference given by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister John Major in London—recorded]

[Text] [Moderator—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to London [words indistinct]. There will be an opening statement by the prime minister followed by a statement by President Gorbachev, then we will have time for a brief question-and-answer session before the president and prime minister have to go off to a working dinner at 10 Downing Street.

During the question-and-answer session I would ask you please to wait for one of the roving microphones to come to you and then stand up and before asking your question to state your name and organization. In terms of selecting questions, I will start and my colleague Mr. Ignatenko will then select someone; but I should stress we will only have a brief [word indistinct] afterwards. Prime Minister:

[Major—in English with superimposed Russian translation] [Words indistinct], well thank you very much. Firstly, my apologies for arriving a little later than you'd expected. Discussions went on a little longer than scheduled, and I apologise for that short delay.

Let me say at the outset, as many of you will know that this morning President Bush and President Gorbachev solved the remaining impediment to a START agreement. I think that is a very remarkable achievement. It was very well received by all the G-7 heads of governments and (?can end) our meeting this afternoon in an extremely admirable way.

Our summit's theme over the last few days has been building world partnerships, and to follow up those words with deeds, we have today, I believe, established our partnership with the Soviet Union on a new and better footing. It is an historic occasion. It demonstrated the importance the summit participants attach to cooperation with the Soviet Union and to integration into the world economy.

And I think it reflects something else as well. It reflects the recognition of new attitudes and new thinking in the Soviet Union.

In keeping with summit style, the emphasis has been on informal, frank, and very direct discussions. Our exchanges have been workmanlike and practical. They have been across the table with questions asked and answers given and not simply formal exchanges around the table. It has been a very positive meeting indeed. It has not been the occasion for specific negotiations or empty rhetoric. There has been an absolutely excellent climate and atmosphere throughout the whole meeting this afternoon.

Our discussions focused primarily on economic reform; but we all recognized behind that, the importance of the political dimension both national and international.

President Gorbachev explained to us all the important changes under way in the Soviet Union, including the proposed new division of powers and responsibilities under the draft Union treaty. Everyone agreed these political and constitutional reforms would help to provide the necessary basis for a successful and irreversible economic reform.

President Gorbachev also set out the plans of the Soviet and republican authorities to reform the Soviet economy. He did so fully and frankly.

All summit participants who had been following the evolution of economic reform plans with a particularly close interest, we were all especially interested to hear how they'd be implemented in practice, about their sequence and the comprehensive nature of their coverage. We very strongly welcomed President Gorbachev's commitment to practical measures of both political and economic reforms and pledged both our support and our encouragement to that process.

We discussed in particular crucial areas for reforms: property rights, market prices, control of government finances and money supply, the breaking up of monopolies and privatization, and the establishment of a legal infrastructure.

Everyone around the table recognized that these moves are all in the best interests of the Soviet people themselves and that only the they can achieve those changes. As I put it during the discussion, the challenges the Soviet leadership faces are formidable, but the opportunities, if they are successful, are limitless. So we agreed that the Soviet Union needed to be integrated with the world economy. But we also agreed that our assistance would not have a lasting effect unless we see signs of political will to create the correct conditions for change. Our objective should be to assist the Soviet Union in the mobilization of its substantial resources. External assistance can help. It can be a catalyst, but only the Soviet Union itself should uncover and develop these resources. The main source must be domestic private investment. The key to this is the creation of legal, political, economic, and social conditions in which capital investment can flourish, in which it can be attracted.

On this basis we agreed on six specific questions. The first concerns special association, special links with the IMF and the World Bank. The participants in the summit welcome the Soviet Union's association with the World Bank and the IMF. We believe that this will be a huge step towards a closer integration of the Soviet economy with world economy. This will bring many benefits to the Soviet Union. It will enable both the Fund and the Bank to give expert assistance in the form of recommendations on all difficult areas of economic policy in which President Gorbachev is working toward reform. Both the Fund and the Bank have immense experience and they can, with the assistance of the government—they have immense experience in decisive areas of fiscal, monetary and structural policy. [sentence as heard]

Second, we have reached agreement on the necessity of continuing cooperation. Participants in the meeting are asking all international organizations, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and also the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to work in close cooperation and to increase their work in support of the Soviet Union. They can provide the Soviet Union with the practical knowledge and expertise they need in setting up a market economy. There are all sorts of areas where this applies. For example, removing price controls, creating conditions for attracting private investment including foreign investment in the Soviet Union, and all the complex processes connected with privatization.

Third, we discussed technical assistance. We agreed on the significance of increasing technical assistance to the Soviet Union. We consider that a closer link should exist, in particular, closer cooperation in energy, conversion, foodstuffs, nuclear safety, and transport sectors, it is these which are the key sectors. We consider that such technical assistance will be given directly by governments, bilaterally and also, through international organizations.

Fourthly, we discussed trade. As Comrade Gorbachev stated during his speech, he fully acknowledges that the collapse of trade between the Soviet Union and its neighbors can be observed, and it is desirable to remedy this situation. We also want to improve the trade accessibility to markets of Soviet goods, and we consider that this will attract additional private investment. Our policy will be governed by this.

Fifthly, and most importantly in my view, we discussed the actions which are to follow these sessions. Today was not the only session and it was not held to leave things the way they were, it was held to examine the problems and resolve them. We discussed the issue of how to act in the future in order to superintend the issues and study the issues of interest to all of us. We agreed to the following program: That the G-7 group, its leader, in the name of all the Seven, must carefully monitor events, and must [hesitates] the acting chairman of the Seven must visit Moscow before the end of this year to meet President Gorbachev to discuss issues of common interest.

I am happy about it, and I am looking forward to this trip; while next year my sucessor at the post of chairman of G-7, Chancellor Kohl of Germany, will carry on this work, and we both will try to contribute to the development of this process.

Six: We have decided to broaden these contacts so that our ministers of finance and ministers of economy should go to the Soviet Union in order to discuss a whole range of issues with their colleagues in the Soviet Union. We think that this will mean broadening and deepening the continuing dialogue between the Soviet Union and the G-7 governments.

As I said a few minutes ago, this day, in my mind, was a day which history will consider to be a certain landmark. We think that this has been the first step towards assisting the Soviet Union in establishing itself as an equal member of the world economic community. It has become clear from today's discussion that President Gorbachev is striving for precisely this, and this is also what we are striving for. We will work for this. I have no doubts that this conference has been a very successful and historic one. I am now handing the conference over to President Gorbachev. Then we will be happy to answer your questions.

[Gorbachev] Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. It seems my task has been made easier by your extensive and detailed speech.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, this day has contained quite a lot. We achieve such days sometimes for years or even decades. As early as eight o'clock this morning, French President Mitterrand and I began a discussion which had great significance. Then I had a very intensive and productive dialogue with Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu. And then one of the important meetings with President Bush took place. We have completed a hard piece of work. Ten years of work are behind us, on the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. The last issues were resolved on the basis of constructive mutual cooperation.

You understand what sort of thing we have been dealing with for all these years, and how difficult it is to have moved toward such a positive result, but now I can say once again, although we have already said it, that all that has been done enables us to submit this treaty for signature and bring it in for consideration by the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. In this connection, President Bush and I have agreed to hold a meeting in Moscow at the very end of July. I invited him to come to Moscow on a visit.

I think this is good news, and not just for today. This is evidence that important changes are taking place in the world which, in spite of all the trials and vicissitudes and dangers, bring such important results. Only a few years ago we could not even dream of this. And in the same spirit, I would like to say that the current G-7 meeting also... [changes thought] I do not know, since we are already used to saying Nine plus One, should I call it seven plus one, in order to make it brief and clear? And let us bring this mechanism into action.

It is also a unique event, and here I share the point of view of Mr. Major, chairman of this meeting, who has done a lot to insure that it was well prepared and carried out in a good, constructive spirit. I must thank him for this and must take this opportunity to thank the citizens of Great Britain for their hospitality, for all they did, even for good weather which enabled all of us to work well and come up with the positive results. I have visualized for myself and was already trying somehow to tell this to many of you in Moscow during our meetings, and now would like to confirm this.

Indeed, events which happened in recent years allowed us to be great; we gained a lot. And among those gains there are such things as unprecedented political dialogue, the successful process of negotiations on the issues of disarmament which resulted in outstanding documents, and the development of the Helsinki process, in this particular case. I mean, the Paris Charter, first of all, and the settling of quite a few very old and acute conflicts, and many other things, and the fact that we have really gained having embarked on the road of perestroyka. We have rejected the methods of the cold war. We have realized that we are part of one and the same civilization. And we came from confrontation and opposition, we searched and came to such achievements. This is also the basis which gives us an opportunity to raise the question that maybe at present we will have a unique chance which can be used in order to promote this process and to consolidate all these positive tendencies, and the more so, as many profound changes which are accompanied by instability and which cause our anxiety and concern have taken shape on the basis of these new processes. It is very important that in this situation no one is tempted to use this to not pursue the interests of the process which we are expecting to help open up new international relations. So this is what the conversation began with today. But taking into account that the declaration is at our disposal, and I have read it, I think that during the preceding days all these topics, global topics, regional matters, in other words, all those things which are happening in our real world and those impulses which occur have become the core of this meeting.

We are ready to cooperate and to bear our responsibility together with all people and, in the present case, with the people who are represented here within the framework of the seven, in order that the positive processes should continue and that, despite all the difficulties, we should make further progress along the path of concord and the improvement of international relations. But pondering at home over everything happening now and what point we have all reached, we came to the conclusion that the process would be more stable, reliable and predictable if suitable changes also occurred in the sphere of economic relations. They also require the interpretation of perestroyka and much of what we are talking about in one way or another, but have not yet formed a system of views, and we have not put forward aims, although I will not deny that the economy is giving out signals. We have to constantly deal both with what arises between countries on the basis of bilateral relations and with what arises in various regions, especially in developing...[hesitates] among...in the Third World, as it were, let us say, although the term has long since become obsolete; well, so as not to spend too much time in thinking, I made use of it.

Nevertheless, all the same, we must, clearly, reach some kind of systematization of all these thoughts and analyses and form some kind of view. Among these problems that we include and which have to be tackled so as to restructure international economic relations as well, we consider that the organic inclusion of the Soviet Union, the Soviet economy, in world economic ties, is one of the key problems.

I would not say that we are not linked to the world economy. No, we trade with the whole world, and we enjoy the fruits of the labor of many peoples. But that is trade, that is good. It is the implementation of individual projects, and that is also not bad. But, we work with different approaches. We do not consider ourselves to be an organic part of the world economy, or of world economic links, to be more exact, for after all, if we are talking about the economy, then we are a part of that economy. And, to a significant degree, we are developing...we find ourselves in a state of anarchy. We consider this to be abnormal. It does not benefit us, nor does it benefit all other countries and peoples.

This is our approach expressed in a few words. Therefore, we have proposed an outline for the Soviet Union's entry into the world economy. It includes far-reaching reforms and changes, not only economic and political in character, which is what we are currently carrying out in our country in order to make us capable of adopting the rules of the game—if I can put it like this—which hold for all the countries in the world.

On the other hand, the organic incorporation of the Soviet Union will not take place if the Soviet Union and its economy are viewed from the concept that took shape during the well-known years of confrontation. During these years, many things piled up in relation to each other, therefore a movement toward meeting halfway is called for, and the obstructions need to be moved, and there are a lot of obstructions.

I could have acquainted my colleagues at this meeting with a list of projects I have in my possession. I could read them out to you, too. But I won't do this. It is a list of dozens of projects which have been almost agreed upon, which have been brought to a great degree of understanding and even agreement by businessmen in our country and other countries. But they are all at a standstill because they keep coming up against COCOM, mainly, and other barriers and obstacles. There are, after all, customs barriers and restrictions connected with GATT. There are the requirements of the IMF. There are certain requirements of the International Bank for Reconstruction, and so on. I have a list, and I have summarized all this. It's an entire volume. So, there is need for movement from the other side. Our conceptual outline contains these two essential points. I presented our plan of action to my colleagues, as to how we intend to proceed in terms of political reform, and how we intend to act now at this stage within the framework of our economic reforms, of the federation. On that basis I expressed the hope that they would be met with understanding.

I emphasize this word understanding, the word with which I began my book about new thinking. We want to be correctly understood. I had reason today, without stretching a point in any way, to tell my colleagues with whom I have been cooperating for many years, looking each of them straight in the eye, that since we have now been understood, this has opened up possibilities for us to act. And as a result of the implementation of new political thinking, we have reached this level of cooperation, this degree of trust, and the possibility of the sort of dicussions that we have been having lately.

I also posed the question so that the choice facing us could be understood. It is our choice, we need it. We will go along the chosen path, because, through reform of the political system, through the Union and through the reform of property relations, we want to bring the powerful stimuli to bear on the political, democratic, economic, and social actions of our people. We want to get away from the restrictive situation connected with the supremacy of the command-administrative system and the total supremacy of state ownership. We want to give society oxygen, and this is what we will do. But we are absolutely convinced that as at that time, in proposing a new way of thinking in our foreign policy, so today, in proposing cooperation on the basis of the movement to meet each other halfway...this is necessary for all of us, and it will be a considerable contribution toward the stabilization of the further growth of all the positive processes taking place in the world.

This is our credo and our essence. At present, we are living through a difficult situation. We are getting out of it, and we will continue to get out of it, and will probably get out of it whether we will be helped or not, and even...this is not the point, the point here is not even aid, but it is about the new character and quality of cooperation when we will form an organic part of the world economy.

So I argued these points. I am very grateful that great interest and attention was displayed toward my open, direct, and honest speech. Dozens of speeches made by everyone followed. It really was a lively—as Mr. Major put it—and open talk without any prepared homework in order to discipline myself and not to exceed the bounds. But I did not manage to be concise anyway. [words indistinct]

The situation was good and we achieved the first stage of understanding which allowed us to face the beginning of the process of new cooperation. I think that if we were to act—and these six conditions and preconditions put forward by Mr. Major give me a hope that we have not just met, talked and departed, as Mr. Prime Minister said, but also reached an important political statement and important political conclusions, and apart from that, we thought about the mechanism for cooperation on the basis of these important political conclusions. I thank you for your attention.

[Moderator—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Thank you, Mr. President. I must stress once again that our time for questions and answers is limited. First, Mr. Stourton from ITN.

[Stourton—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Evidently, the seven were not satisfied with the initial reform proposals that Mr. Gorbachev proposed. Can I ask Mr. Gorbachev if he introduced anything new into the meaning of his reform proposals? And did the prime minister hear anything new to convince him that the reforms really will take place?

[Major—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Allow me to answer first, Edward. The great advantage lay in the fact that we were able to speak around one table, not just looking at some document, but speaking face to face, asking detailed questions on the document and making an appraisal of how the document will be implemented. There is no other such opportunity. There never had been that kind of opportunity to (?question) President Gorbachev. It has been a very valuable opportunity. Problems were solved together today, no one expected it to be like that. What we expected from today was that we would start the process of dialogue and decide how to conduct it properly. That was done in practice, and I cannot overestimate the importance of it. It is vitally important that the dialogue is now in progress and that it will continue. The reforms that the USSR is carrying out are vast. One only has to look back and see the difficulties that existed as regards certain elements of the privatization program of the sort that we have had, let's say, in the United Kingdom over the past 10 years; and, while we consolidated the scale of the task that the USSR is now trying to effect, naturally we did not solve all the problems today and, naturally there will be many questions to which we will wish to return. But we did assure ourselves today of the promising nature and purposefulness of the reforms that are being carried out in the USSR, and of the need to pursue this through constant dialogue.

[Gorbachev] I hardly have anything else to add, because Mr. Major has said it. I will simply say that my colleagues were satisfied with the fact that the president of the country came here not only with his own opinion, but also with the opinion agreed with by all the leaders of the republics, the leaders of governments, and this meant ideas and views that were worked out jointly. This was particularly highly assessed because great interest was shown in precisely this fact. But I must say that in the USSR we have now in fact reached the stage of a deeper understanding of the need for reforms and of constructive cooperation between all democratic forces, between the republican authorities and the Union with a view to successful implementation of radical reform in all areas.

[Unidentified correspondent] Soviet television. A question to the UK prime minister. Does he consider that today's meeting in London will initiate a qualitatively new relationship between East and West?

[Major—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Well, I believe I can answer that question very briefly and very directly. Yes, I think that has already been done. I think it is a new start and a very valuable start.

[Gorbachev] I am of the same opinion. London has initiated the move toward a new quality of cooperation.

[Hanrahan—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Brian Hanrahan, BBC Television. Mr. Gorbachev, much has been said by one of your emissaries about the need for large funds, large sums, to help the USSR to extricate itself from its current difficulties. Are you disappointed that you haven't received it? And do you think that this will affect the pace of reform and will possibly lead to social instability, as Yevgeniy Primakov and Mr. Major said the other day? And did the three of you take this into account?

[Gorbachev] I already answered this question in Moscow. In general, I said that the meeting to be held in London was not a meeting of finance ministers but of leaders of states. I believe that the events that have taken place here and the political results they have culminated in exceed recent expectations expressed in the press, which often reduces everything to this single question. It is cooperation that we are talking about, and cooperation presupposes a reinterpretation and the achievement of qualitatively new forms of cooperation in all areas.

[Kuntyanskiy] Novoye Vremya, Moscow, Aleksandr Kuntyanskiy. A question for the prime minister and the president. You are both participating in the G7 for the first time, here in London, for different reasons, and you both are the center of events, again for different reasons. How do you view this seven plus one process and its future? How do you see relations between the Group of Seven industrial countries and the Soviet Union in, say, two, three, or maybe five years?

[Gorbachev] First, I shall start with the point that Mr. Major and I have already had the opportunity to meet: There was his visit to us, and we did not need long to quickly understand the main issues and to start a very active dialogue. I welcome the very fact that we have not wasted time. The Soviet-British dialogue has reached a very high level, and I must say that it is continuing to grow, thanks to joint efforts, in the conditions now of cooperation between, in this case, myself and Major as well. Therefore, the fact that Mr. Major and I are in this situation is good, I am very glad. It is helpful for my visit which begins tomorrow, and it will be even easier for us to deepen mutual understanding and our bilateral cooperation.

As for how we view this seven plus one process of cooperation and how it will develop, I think it is developing. As you remember, there was Paris and my letter. Then there was Houston and the initiative—from the British, incidentally—to invite me to meet the Group of Seven. Now, the British are the hosts, and I am here, and this is a very important event, a very important meeting. Mr. Major has outlined to you how events will develop further in the immediate future. I think a start has been made to the process. The ice has cracked, as you and I say, Comrade Kuntyanskiy. So once the first crack has appeared in the ice—I like this quotation, this expression—then the whole mass of ice starts moving down river. That is all good. It promises renewal.

[Major, from superimposed Russian translation] When we invited President Gorbachev to join the seven it was naturally in the expectation that this would play a certain role in deepening the process and continuing it in coming years. Naturally we put forward the invitation, never thinking that this would be a sole occasion but that in one way or another we would continue to expand and deepen the close relationship which has existed between the Western industrialized countries and the Soviet Union over the past few years. We take great interest in the changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union over the last few years and we greatly admire the way in which those changes have been brought about. Of course we see a continuation of the dialogue. This is our intention. Happily it has proved possible for our intention to be developed systematically through the chairman of the G7, and this is going to continue.

[Bolton, from superimposed Russian translation] Adam Bolton, Sky News. Clearly this is not the occasion, but do you both agree that to make the Soviet Union an organic part of the world economy at some point and at some time, there will have to be a large transfer of funds from the G7 countries to the Soviet Union?

[Major, from superimposed Russian translation] Permit me to reply first. Much has to be done. We discussed a whole range today. But today we did not discuss the issue of the large-scale financing of one nation by another. Much help and encouragement for the Soviet economy in the coming years will, we hope, be generated quite naturally by the private investment that will be encouraged by the present reforms in the Soviet Union. I was very heartened by the fact that this was emphasized by President Gorbachev in our discussions, but during the proces of our dialogue today we did not discuss the transfer of large-scale funds. As the president said a few minutes ago, that was not the issue on the agenda today and it lies a little way into the future.

[Gorbachev] I should like to add that the USSR is an enormous market and a promising one with enormous potential possibilities, and to a considerable extent it has not yet been developed, that is the first point. Second, if the obstacles that I mentioned are removed, then right now major projects could get under way in the sphere of energy, transport, food and petrochemicals and many other projects, moreover multi-billion projects. This would be mutually advantageous. This process will be even more successful, if we do not delay the solution of such a cardinal problem as the convertibility of the ruble. Indeed this problem was discussed today and in this respect there is a mutual understanding that this problem needs to be resolved.

[Druzenko] Anatoliy Druzenko, IZVESTIYA newspaper. Still I'd like to go back to the "seven plus one" formula—in my view the plus sign is very symbolic here. How do Mr. Prime Minister and Comrade President see the plus for each of the components: Is it a plus for the seven or a plus for the one?

[Major—in English with superimposed Russian translation] Well, the seven Western democracies have decided that to have a continuing dialogue is in our interests as well as in the interests of the Soviet Union. In an institutional sense it is too early to talk about what this dialogue is leading to, as I have already said; but the dialogue will continue at this forum, and this is without doubt. I cannot tell you at the moment what this dialogue will develop into; nobody else will be able to tell you. We have to wait for the development of events for this.

[Gorbachev] You know, the dialogue is under way. G-7 has existed for seventeen years, but for the last six years problems have been tackled outside the G-7 framework in other forms; but the fact that today we managed to reach in this case this plus, Comrade Druzenko, I think, generally speaking, this is a symbol of great changes. A pooling of efforts is coming to replace confrontation and opposition—a minus and a worse than a minus; and at first, perhaps, the framework of searching for a dialogue, and now already the attainment of mechanisms is appearing, then projects, and then results might appear. So, I think, this process is very promising in general.

[Moderator—in English with superimposed Russian translation] I am afraid that in view of a working supper which is planned for now, we have to stop here. Thank you.

Reportage on News Conference

LD1807015091 Moscow TASS in English 2127 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 18 TASS—Today's meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and the G-7 leaders will go down in history as a remarkable milestone, British Prime Minister John Major said today.

Major and the Soviet president addressed a joint news conference in London.

Major outlined a six-point plan for promoting Soviet reforms, agreed upon during the meeting. The plan for the Soviet Union included special associate status in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

The G-7 leaders called on the organisation for economic development, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to invigorate their efforts and provide know-how and expert assistance for the Soviet Union to help its transition to a market economy.

Participants agreed to broaden technical assistance to the Soviet Union in key sectors, such as power engineering, including nuclear power engineering, military conversion, distribution of goods and transport, Major said.

Summit participants also discussed facilitating access for Soviet goods to the Western market, Major said.

In addition, participants agreed that Major, as the host of the current G-7 summit, would visit Moscow before the end of the year to continue cooperation.

"We offer economic cooperation on the basis of reciprocity," Gorbachev told the news conference. He said this is the Soviet leadership's credo in their approach to cooperation with the West.

"We are ready to cooperate and bear our share of responsibility together with all peoples, in this case with the peoples of the countries whose leaders are attending the London summit," Gorbachev said.

Gorbachev called on the West to promote changes in economic relations, adequate to those in international political relations, in order to make the process stable and reliable.

Gorbachev noted that during the meeting, he outlined the concept for the Soviet Union's inclusion in the world economy.

Gorbachev noted that he was in London to express views elaborated together with republican leaders.

Further on News Conference

LD1707214191 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—The British prime minister noted that the great advantage of today's meeting between Gorbachev and the G-7 leaders was that the interlocutors could directly exchange opinions.

Far from all problems have been resolved, but nobody expected that all problems will find solution, Major said. He said the sides expected to begin a dialogue and choose the course for developing it and they did it.

Noting that he was in London to express views elaborated together with republican leaders, the Soviet president said the Soviet Union has approached deeper understanding of the need for constructive interaction between all democratic forces, republics and the centre, aiming to implement radical reforms in all spheres of life.

Addressing the news conference, the British prime minister said the historic meeting of Gorbachev with the G-7 leaders demonstrated the importance attached by participants in the summit to cooperating with the Soviet Union and helping its integration in the world economy.

Noting the businesslike, practical, informal and sincere character of discussions, Major said participants welcomed Gorbachev's adherence to practical steps aimed to implement economic and political reforms and assured the Soviet leader that they will support and encourage the process, Major said.

Participants discussed vital spheres for reforms, including property rights, market prices, state control over state finances and other issues.

The group aims to help the Soviet Union mobilise its considerable resources, Major said. He outlined a six-point plan for promoting Soviet reforms, agreed upon during the meeting.

The plan for the Soviet Union included granting the USSR special associate status in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and more efforts by the Organisation for Economic Development, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to give the Soviet Union expert assistance in transition to a market economy and broaden technical assistance in various spheres, including power engineering and transport.

In addition, participants agreed that Major, as the host of the current G-7

Meets Press on Talks With G-7 Leaders

LD1707200691 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] London July 17 TASS—Today's meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and the G-7 leaders was good partnership, British Prime Minister John Major said today.

Major and the Soviet president addressed a joint news conference in London.

Major outlined six specific directions for cooperation with the Soviet Union, about which the G-7 leaders agreed with the Soviet president.

The British premier characterised today's meeting as a historic event. He said the day will go down in history as a remarkable milestone.

President Mikhail Gorbachev said his meeting with the G-7 leaders was "unique" in its character.

Addressing the joint news conference, Gorbachev focused on the main aspect of his statement before the G-7 leaders.

"We offer economic cooperation on the basis of reciprocity," the Soviet president said. He said this is the Soviet leadership's credo in their approach to cooperation with the West.

"We are ready to cooperate and bear our share of responsibility together with all peoples, in this case with the peoples of the countries, whose leaders are attending the London summit," Gorbachev said.

In this connection, Gorbachev called on the West to promote changes in economic relations, adequate to those in international political relations, in order to make the process stable and reliable.

Gorbachev noted that during the meeting, he outlined the concept for the Soviet Union's inclusion in the world economy. In this context, he called on the leading Western countries to abandon the "opposition" outlook on cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Among other tasks for restructuring international relations, Gorbachev noted "the Soviet economy's integral inclusion in world economic ties". According to Gorbachev, trade and limited projects of the USSR with Western countries will not suffice today.

Gorbachev said he had told the G-7 leaders that they should understand the Soviet Union. "I posed the issue so that they understood us. This is our choice. We will follow the course of reforms," Gorbachev said. summit, would visit Moscow before the end of the year to continue cooperation.

Meets Andreotti, Mulroney

LD1807102691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 18 Jul 91

[Text] The stay of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in London continues. Today he had meetings with Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

At this moment Mikhail Gorbachev begins talks with British Prime Minister John Major, which will be followed by a visit to Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace.

More on Gorbachev-Andreotti Meeting

LD1807130391 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 18 Jul 91

[Text] London July 18 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev met Italian Prime Minister Giulio Androtti on the morning of July 18. It was the continuation of a friendly dialogue, started long ago, between people who understand each other perfectly.

Both leaders praised the results of the Soviet president's meetings with leaders of the seven industrially developed countries. A good, constructive beginning was set for new cooperation on a world scale. Andreotti stressed that Gorbachev's speech and the exchange of views that followed it had enabled G7 to draw more far- reaching conclusions than those they were inclined to draw before the meeting.

Gorbachev and Andreotti discussed bilateral relations between their two countries, which are developing successfully. Gorbachev pointed out that political and business cooperation with the Italian leadership was unprecedented. Italy supported us at the most difficult moments of our development, and this is especially appreciated, the Soviet leader said.

The two leaders touched upon the processes taking place in Yugoslavia. They reiterated their support for the integrity of the Yugoslav state, as well as its unity, which can probably assume new forms and be based on law, the principles of the all-European process and respect for the interests of all nations of the country.

The conversation, held in a cordial atmosphere, was attended by Gianni de Michelis from the Italian side, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh from the Soviet side and other officials.

Mitterrand on Assistance

LD1707153991 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By Sergey Sosnovskiy, Andrey Fedyashin, Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] London July 17 TASS—A broad range of topical problems of the present was discussed at the London meeting of the seven leading industrialised states. Priority has naturally been given to economic matters, French President Francois Mitterrand told a news conference here today.

"Discussing political aspects of the international situation we have expressed a political will to assist reforms conducted in the Soviet Union by President Gorbachev," the French president said. "The assistance to the Soviet Union will assume various forms which will be specified after the leaders of the countries of the Group of Seven meet the Soviet leader."

"We believe Mikhail Gorbachev carried out huge work over the past six years to implement transformations that are of decisive importance" for the evolution of the international situation. "The scope of these reforms could not have been imagined just a few years ago," Mitterrand said.

"However, this does not involve issuing a blank check to the Soviet leader, as some wish to present this. It would be humiliating for a great nation. The point of the matter is to help the Soviet Union in the transition to a market economy and integration into the international community," he said.

"The common willingness to contribute to the envigoration of the Soviet economy has been expressed at the meeting. The problem is in the level, forms and schedule for this aid, and it will depend on the level and scope of economic reforms in the USSR," Mitterrand said.

The task of conferences of the top seven is not to decide the destinies of the world, the French president said. He said that the leaders of the seven top industrialised nations were only expressing their opinion about possible ways of resolving some or other problems.

Referring to control of the transfer of arms and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Mitterrand said France declared against the creation of a special mechanism in the framework of the Group of Seven to resolve these problems.

The role of the seven is in maintaining the efforts in the framework of the existing structures, and in perfecting the existing mechanisms and promoting the enhancement of the United Nations competence.

Asked about the contents of today's meeting with the Soviet president, Mitterrand said his impression of the Soviet president was that of a calm and responsible person. He said Gorbachev looks like a man who can draw lessons from events.

Ignatenko on G-7 Meeting

LD1807014191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0104 GMT 18 Jul 91

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] London, 18 Jul (TASS)—If one were to call the event-packed 17 July one of the most significant dates in the history of the world community, this would not be an exaggeration. Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the USSR president's press service, said this late on Wednesday evening at a briefing on the results of meetings between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the leaders of the Group of Seven—the world's most industrially developed countries.

Despite the late hour of the briefing, a large number of journalists gathered, waiting impatiently for the Soviet appraisal of the results of talks between the Soviet president and leaders of the G-7 countries. M. Gorbachev's meeting with the leaders of these states had a thorough character, Ignatenko indicated. During a substantive conversation they talked about major concepts and a philosophical vision of our future relations, he noted.

One of the central questions discussed in detail at the meeting was the whole complex of mutual relations and cooperation between the center and the Union republics. In this area the president's positions were sufficiently solid, since he had come to London with the mandate from Novo-Ogarevo where the leaders of these republics had approved M. Gorbachev's proposed approaches to the problems discussed at the meeting with the G-7 leaders, Ignatenko stressed.

"Today a qualitatively new page in the history of the world community has opened," Ignatenko stated. "We can confidently say that after the meeting in London between M. Gorbachev and the leaders of the Group of Seven, the world climate has improved."

Bessmertnykh's London Activities 17 Jul

LD1807100891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0002 GMT 18 Jul 91

[Text] London, 17 Jul (TASS)—Parallel with the president's itinerary, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A.A. Bessmertnykh has held a series of conversations with colleagues also accompanying their leaders at the London meetings.

At A.A. Bessmertnykh's talks with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker and the President's National Security adviser B. Scowcroft, the recent intensive work to resolve the last technical problems of the treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons was successfully completed.

During A.A. Bessmertnykh's conversations with the foreign ministers of Germany—H-D Genscher, Italy—G. de Michelis, and Japan—T. Nakayama, in addition to the economic topics focused on in M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with the leaders of the seven, a broad range of topical international problems and matters of bilateral relations was examined. Particular attention was paid to the issue of a Mideast settlement, where encouraging movements toward the convening of a peace conference have appeared, and also to the situation in Yugoslavia in light of the efforts being made to maintain a political dialogue there. The matter of accelerating a final Cambodian settlement and the situation in the Asia-Pacific region were also touched upon.

The ministers highly assessed the breakthrough reached at the strategic offensive weapons reduction talks, and the significance of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

Vorontsov Comments on Iraqi Nuclear Program

LD1607105191 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 16 JUL 91

[By Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations July 16 TASS—An international inspector addressing the U.N. Security Council consultations on Monday described the Iraqi nuclear programme as virtual repetition of the Manhattan project. However, he was unable to offer clear proof that Iraq was creating nuclear weapons.

The expert pointed out that for the amount of spending and tendency, the Iraqi programme looks similar to what the United States was doing in the forties when designing and building the atomic bomb ("the Manhattan project") and that it cannot be described as peaceful research.

The Security Council analysed for several hours a detailed report of experts of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) based on two inspections in Iraq. IAEA Director General Hans Blix who arrived for the consultations commented on the report.

It was noted that Iraq was implementing a programme of uranium enrichment by an electromagnetic method which is uneconomical and unsuitable for nuclear power. When this method is used, expenditures on receiving enriched uranium are ten times the worth of the energy which can be produced from it. Experts believe this indicates that the purposes of uranium enrichment are far from peaceful.

Although after two inspections of IAEA in Iraq, Baghdad supplied additional information about its programme and admitted that it had a secret nature, the assesment of this data has not been made at the consultations. A third group of inspectors now works in Iraq to check this information.

Although Iraq supplied more information, Security Council members have doubts that Iraq has revealed to the international community all it has in the sphere. Experts have already noted some discrepancies of this data with what they have been able to discover during inspections.

Inspectors noted that they used not only Iraqi data but also information received from intelligence services. They suspect that Iraq may have concealed part of enriched uranium in secret storages lined with graphite which are virtually impossible to detect.

Security Council consultation showed that a number of problems are unclear to IAEA inspectors. They will continue their expertise. Members of the Security Council confirmed the demand to the Iraqi Government to provide a full and clear picture of entire nuclear research. The information Baghdad had to supply after inspectors had established facts indicating the existence of a secret nuclear programme is not enough.

A meeting of permanent Security Council members was held after Security Council consultations. It discussed possible steps to put a stop to Iraqi nuclear programme. The meeting arrived at the conclusion that the matter deserves special attention, Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR ambassador to the United Nations, told TASS.

Following the adoption of Resolution 687 on the basis of the settlement of the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis, Iraq was obliged to reveal its programme, Vorontsov said. Iraq tried to conceal its pragramme for uranium enrichment, which, by all indications, required huge expenditures and had a military nature, and this gives food for thought, he said.

The five billion dollars Baghdad invested in uranium enrichment is too much for just one reactor. Many aditional facilities were built. It is necessary to see the equipment which has not been shown. IAEA inspectors should be given support in Iraq when checking elements of uranium enrichment programme, the Soviet representative said.

He expressed the opinion that a special resolution of the Security Council is needed to assist the work of inspection groups in Iraq.

Vorontsov said the third group of IAEA inspectors concludes work in Iraq on Tuesday and expressed the hope that it will deliver a report to the Security Council by July 19. Other IAEA missions will then be sent to Iraq.

"This is a serious matter. It is a matter of whether or not Iraq has a nuclear weapons programme. It should not have such a programme", Vorontsov said.

Soviet Experts Admit Faults in Nuclear Reactors

AU1607105091 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 16 Jul 91 pp 1, 2

[By Joachim Wille: "Moscow Admits Faults in Nuclear Reactors"]

[Text] Frankfurt, 15 July—The nuclear reactors of the Soviet WWER-440 series, which are used not only in Kozloduy in Bulgaria, but also in the CSFR, the Kola Peninsula, and in Novo-Voronezh (Russia), do not meet "today's demands" as far as safety is concerned. This has been revealed in a paper of the "State Committee for Monitoring Nuclear Safety," which has been made available to FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU. The likelihood of a meltdown, a mega catastrophe, is 200 times greater than in the case of reactors in the West.

The Moscow paper on reactor safety was drawn up for a meeting of the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency, and mainly deals with the pressurized water reactor Kola 1, which was put into operation in 1973. Soviet scientists have worked out that the likelihood of a meltdown, which would release massive quantities of radioactive substances in the environment, is "once in 180 reactor operating years." Adding up the years that all WWER reactors have been in operation, this operating time has almost been reached; apart from the four closed reactors at Greifswald there are eight more WWER-440's in the Soviet Union and East Europe, all of which were put into operation in the seventies. According to a study of the Society for Reactor Safety of 1989, the likelihood of a meltdown in an FRG nuclear power plant is "once in 33,000 reactor years."

The calculations of the Moscow experts do not account for the possibility of an accident as a result of "outside influence" (such as an earthquake or an airplane crash), of a major leakage in the plant's primary cooling circuit that cannot be controlled by the emergency cooling system; those would have even increased the likelihood of an accident. Other factors that might decrease safety were also ignored: the scientists start from the assumption that, technologically, the plant is in good condition and the operating staff is well trained. As one has learned in the meantime, this does not apply to the four WWER-440 reactors in Kozloduy, which the Bulgarian government is temporarily shutting down at the urgent request of the West.

Western reactor experts believe that attempts to retrofit the WWER-440 reactors with modern components are doomed to fail. Michael Sailer, of the Darmstadt-based Eco-Institute, told FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU that the offer by the Greifswald managers to sell components to the Kozloduy plant can only be described as criminal. "The likelihood" that components vital for safety will "fail" is so great that the attempt to continue operating the reactors on a permanent basis cannot be tolerated.

Preparations for Human Rights Conference

OW1607081991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] Preparations are now in the final stage for a human dimension conference in Moscow due to start on September 10. Officials of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's department for humanitarian cooperation and human rights say CSCE countries are holding a final round of consultations to hammer out the structure and content of the final document.

The ministry showed great interest in what is described as parallel activities to be held by Soviet and foreign non-government organisations, with the organising committee and secretariat being set up on the initiative from a number of Soviet groups. An estimated 15,000 representatives of such organisations are expected to take part.

Soviet Foreign Ministry officials speak of an atmosphere of well-wishing now emerging in the run up to the forum. However, a number of arrangement difficulties arose because the organising committee has so far failed to book hotel accommodation for the delegates in the absence of hard currency, something that hotel managers want as pre-payment.

Black Sea Deputy Foreign Ministers Meet

LD1107154891 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 11 Jul 91

[By Aleksandr Kanishev]

[Text] Moscow July 11 TASS—A two-day conference of deputy foreign affairs ministers of Black Sea countries opens in the "Nakhabino" centre near Moscow today. Deputy ministers from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Turkey, Romania, Greece, as well as representatives of Yugoslavia are taking part in this meeting. The Greek and Yugoslavian delegations will be observers at the meeting.

In accordance with information from the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the session is to continue the work which was begun in Ankara in December last year on preparing a document on economic cooperation between the Black Sea countries.

Vitaliy Churkin, an official representative of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs reported at a briefing yesterday that the session is to discuss the prospects of developing multi-lateral contacts between the countries of the Black Sea region on the basis of the principles of all-European cooperation that were secured in the Helsinki Final Act and in the conclusive documents of the CSCE sessions, as well as in the Paris Charter for a new Europe.

It is important to note one more fact connected with solving the problems in economic cooperation between the Black Sea countries. From the very beginning, the Soviet republics have been participating in this work. Representatives from the ministries of foreign affairs of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russia and the Ukraine are taking part in the conference.

Spokesman Reports Irish Foreign Minister's Visit

LD1607145591 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS—It was agreed that Ireland's Minister for Foreign Affairs Gerard Collins will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union between July 20-23, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

In Moscow Collins will hold talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and meet other representatives of the Soviet leadership, Vitaliy Churkin said. During the visit there will be signed several Soviet-Irish documents, including a protocol on consultations, an agreement on cultural cooperation and a declaration on the development and perfection of economic, industrial and scientific cooperation.

The Soviet Union, Churkin said, regards the forthcoming visit by the Irish minister for foreign affairs as an important stage in developing Soviet-Irish relations and in strengthening the traditional spirit of good neighbourliness and beneficial cooperation.

Northeast Asia

Japanese POW Leader on Talks with Yanayev

OW1807002191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Recorded interview with Rokuro Saito, chairman of the National Conference for Pensions for Former POWs, by Radio Moscow reporter (Zudlov) at International Hotel in Moscow on 10 July]

[Excerpt] Radio Moscow reporter (Zudlov) interviewed Mr. Rokuro Saito, chairman of Japan's National Conference for Pensions for Former POWs, at the International Hotel on 10 July. On that day, Mr. Saito met with Soviet Vice President Yanayev at the Kremlin before the interview. The following is the transcribed interview with Mr. Saito:

[Begin recording in Japanese] (Zudlov): Mr. Saito, could you explain the objective of your trip to the Soviet Union?

Saito: On 18 April, I met President Gorbachev on his visit to Japan, and made a two-point proposal. This time, I came here to receive the Soviet Government's response to my proposal from Vice President Yanayev. I had a talk with the vice president today for about 50 minutes on various important topics. Those topics included issues of the namelists of former Japanese POWs, Japanese people's visits to graves in the Soviet Union, and the retrieval of Japanese POWs' lost honor. The last issue has already been settled . I think that the achievement was reached owing to Soviet policies based on new political thinking. As well as former POWs' family members and other people concerned with the POW issue, the Japanese public have rated the Soviet decision highly.

However, there are still some problems which remain unsettled. The issue of labor certificates is one of those problems. Each POW has a right to have a certificate of his labor camp experience and medical record. The Soviet Union has the responsibility to issue these papers to former Japanese POWs, but this still remains unsettled.

The Japanese Government requires the certificate to pay compensation to former POWs detained by the Soviet Union, because the government does not know whether or not a former POW was really injured in a battle with Soviet forces unless the Soviet Government certifies it.

Former Japanese troops are entitled to pensions as provided by the Public Officials Pensions Law, but civilians cannot receive them. Since all the identification documents of Japanese detainees are held by the Soviet side, they currently have no way to indentify themselves. The POW namelist Gorbachev brought recently only covers the war dead. Family members of those filed on the namelist as servicemen have applied for compensation from the Japanese Government; they can receive the compensation as provided by the law. However, we have not received any namelists of war survivors. The labor certificate will supply this in place of the survivor namelist. I asked for the vice president's understanding of the issue at today's meeting.

There is a small village called (Ustsvirsk) in the vicinity of Irkutsk. The Japanese soldiers' graveyard in the village is so devastated that dogs hang around there with Japanese soldiers' bones in their mouths. I asked the Soviet side to fix up the place as soon as possible, noting that a Japanese grave visit team is planning to visit (Ustsvirsk) next spring, and that they would feel very depressed on seeing the situation. Vice President Yanayev readily promised that the Soviet side would settle the two issues as soon as possible. I feel that my meeting with the vice president was very fruitful. Japan and the Soviet Union need not maintain the past antagonism when those issues are settled. Everything is becoming alright now. I think that it is about time that Japan established full-scale economic exchanges with the Soviet Union, just like its present ties with such nations as Germany, Italy, and the United States. I really had fruitful talks with the vice president. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Japan Not Reciprocating Military Concessions

PM1607132191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Colonel V. Rodin: "Tokyo Is Not in a Hurry"]

[Text] Military problems connected with ensuring the two countries' security were discussed during M.S. Gorbachev's recent visit to Japan. This was also reflected in the Soviet-Japanese joint statement. The main aim of the discussion on these subjects was to eliminate mutual concern and thus promote the creation of more favorable conditions for the development of bilateral cooperation.

The USSR president familiarized the Japanese leadership and that country's public with practical measures to reduce the Soviet Armed Forces and decrease military activity in the Near East and in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. And in response to concern expressed by the Japanese leadership about what it sees as the high level of the Soviet military presence in the Far East, a proposal was made on establishing permanent dialogue with Japan on military problems. The Soviet-Japanese joint statement reflected the USSR's intention to immediately implement measures to reduce the Soviet military contingent on the Kuril Islands, whose ownership was and still is the main bone of contention in Soviet-Japanese relations.

In this way, the Soviet Union has demonstrated its sincere desire to further the reduction of the level of military confrontation in the Far East. It provided guarantees that the USSR will continue to exert efforts in this direction. However, it is obvious that mutual relations can only be fruitful when both sides take positive steps.

Unfortunately, information from the Japanese mass media does not give grounds for optimism.

So, the ink of the Soviet-Japanese joint statement had not even dried when 22 April the Japanese Parliament announced its military allocations for 1991, which exceeded the 1990 military budget by 5.5 percent and total around $30 billion. Incidentally, it can be noted here that of the "big seven" leading capitalist countries that are taking practical measures toward a real or at least symbolic reduction in armed forces and military expenditure for the next few years, only Japan stands apart with its plans to allocate around $175 billion to its 1991-1995 military program. This exceeds the military expenditure of the previous five years by 28 percent.

Tokyo explains this increase in terms of inflation, an increase in expenditure on the remuneration of personnel, and other reasons. Be that as it may. But in that case, why plan—having demanded a reduction in the Soviet military contingent on the Kuril Islands—to deploy new formations on the island of Hokkaido adjacent to the USSR's borders, including the first units in the Japanese ground forces to be equipped with cruise missiles with a range of up to 100km?

The methodical buildup in the effective combat strength and numerical strength of the Japanese armed forces is proceeding in parallel with the activation of their operations and combat training. At the same time, emphasis is laid on training exercises carried out in the north of the country in which modern concepts of training and carrying out operations are rehearsed.

The annual training exercise to build up the group of troops (forces) on Hokkaido is most indicative in this respect. An exercise of this kind has started this year too—on 25 June—and will carry on for over a month. Representatives of the Japan Defense Agency hastened to announce that the training exercise is of a purely defensive nature and is intended to be a rehearsal for the defense of Hokkaido in the face of an emergency situation. However, according to foreign observers, the personnel of the forces involved in the training exercise and also their orientation and a number of features of a purely military nature lend this training exercise a specific political significance.

It must be noted first and foremost that during the training exercise a massed transfer to Hokkaido of large contingents of forces and military hardware is taking place. According to data from the Japanese press, over 5,000 men and around 1,300 units of combat and motor transport equipment from the Japanese ground forces alone are being transferred by railroad, motor, naval, and air forms of transport. At the same time additional aviation and naval forces are being redeployed to the northern areas of the country. It is noteworthy that, according to the plans of this "defensive" training exercise, it is envisaged that active use of tank landing ships and air force transport aircraft will be made for the disembarkation of naval and air assault forces. Multi-tonne cargo and passenger ferries are also extensively used to redeploy troops, hardware, and resources, and these are seen by military specialists of all the countries in world, including Japan, as a naval forces reserve for carrying out assault operations in times of war. The "never-fading" thesis about "the military threat from the Russians who have unlawfully occupied and continuing to hold the southern part of the Kuril islands" is the propaganda backdrop to this training exercise.

It is clear to anybody, even the uninitiated, that carrying out such measures, particularly after the beginning of Soviet-Japanese talks on the reduction of military activity in the Far East, is impeding successful progress on this path.

You get the impression that the Japanese side, particularly as personified by its military department, is aiming to achieve unilateral concessions from the Soviet Union in the military sphere while at the same time avoiding specific actions in response under various pretexts. And after all, the conditions in which Soviet people are to live and be involved in joint economic activity with their neighbors is not a matter of indifference to them, particularly to the people living on the Kuril islands and Sakhalin. Consequently, questions of reducing the military presence and decreasing military activity must be resolved with consideration being given to understanding the balance of interests and ensuring the sides' trust and equal security.

Rogachev Interviewed on Recent Visit to Japan

OW1707062791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Report on interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev by Moscow Radio reporter (Kavkaz)]

[Text] Moscow Radio reporter (Kavkaz) asked the following question: Please tell us how many times you have held discussions with Japanese deputy foreign ministerial officials? What is the significance of the meetings? What are the concrete results of the meetings?

Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev replied as follows: The deputy ministerial level meeting held on 26 June between the foreign ministries of the Soviet Union and Japan was the fifth such meeting I have attended. The first was in November 1987. Regular Soviet- Japanese deputy foreign ministerial meetings started twelve years ago in 1979, and over the years the deputy foreign ministerial meetings have become a major factor in promoting bilateral political dialogue. Within the framework of the meeting, we have thoroughly exchanged views on urgent issues in world politics. Such exchanges have enabled the two countries to compare their respective responses to urgent international issues and to expand common or identical points in the two countries' positions.

In view of the major role played by the USSR and Japan in world affairs, we attach great significance to such an undertaking. There is no need for me to reiterate the importance of the various Soviet-Japanese issues in the bilateral deputy foreign ministerial meetings. If I am allowed to make one point here, I would like to say that when dealing with Soviet-Japanese relations, we discuss concrete issues while giving consideration to the present state and prospects of development of bilateral relations. I think many of the accomplishments made at working level discussions have brought about government level agreements. Of course, we also pay sufficient attention to the implementation of the agreements already signed. For instance, during the June meetings there were discussions on how to implement the fifteen agreements signed during President Gorbachev's visit to Japan in April.

Has there been any visible progress on the issue of signing the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty? Please tell us what were the results of the recent meetings in Tokyo.

Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev answered as follows: Since the time the permanent working group was created, the Soviet Union and Japan have undertaken extremely difficult tasks. Thanks to this, both sides have come to understand the each other's position and views, a common understanding has been reached on certain major provisions of the peace treaty, and agreement has been reached on the text of many provisions. During the recent meeting of the working group in Tokyo, there were discussions on how to concretely implement the agreements reached during President Gorbachev's Japan visit on the peace treaty. These agreements were cited in Article 4 of the Soviet-Japanese joint communique of 18 April 1991. It is deemed necessary to make the activities of the working group as fruitful as possible from the point of view of accomplishing the major task—that is, the formulation and signing of the peace treaty—by keeping in mind the issues cited in the Soviet-Japanese joint communique as mentioned above while paying attention to the activities of the working group.

How has President Gorbachev's visit to Japan in April affected the content and atmosphere of Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev's talks with Japanese leaders? How feasible is a visit to the Soviet Union by Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu in return for President Gorbachev's Japan visit?

As a result of President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, a qualitatively new situation has been created in Soviet-Japanese relations. It has upgraded bilateral relations to a level and scale compatible with the two major powers' status and role. The possibility for substantial progress in issues pending between the two countries, including the peace treaty, has emerged. There has been a major improvement in the general atmosphere of bilateral relations. Needless to say, this has a favorable impact on Soviet-Japanese dialogue as a whole. The meeting which I recently attended in Tokyo was no exception. The discussions were of a constructive nature, issues were deliberated in a positive atmosphere, and both sides were eager to seek points of compromise. One could also feel the desire to cultivate the potentials of cooperation at the working level.

As to the question of Prime Minister Kaifu's visit to the Soviet Union, it is well known that the Soviet president has offered an official invitation to the Japanese side. However, further adjustments need to be made concerning the visit's schedule. The problem here lies not only in that preparations for summit meetings are very tedious, but also in that both sides believe that such visits should be substantial and meaningful and should provide further stimulation to the development of bilateral relations. We intend to cooperate with the Japanese side in handling this issue.

Last, I would like to add that a meeting between the president of the Soviet Union and the prime minister of Japan is scheduled to be held in London on 17 July. This meeting will further promote contacts between the leaders of both countries. We place great expectations on the meeting.

Fisheries Cooperation With DPRK Analyzed

SK1707124291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1330 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] The Soviet Maritime Province in the Soviet Far East and the DPRK are neighbors and the two neighbors have continued mutual cooperation in a variety of areas for many years.

(Natalya Deka), station correspondent based in Vladivostok, asked (Vladimir Gulusenko), deputy director of the department for economic cooperation with foreign countries under control of the Primorskiy Kray executive committee, for his analysis of the results and prospects.

(Vladimir Gulusenko) says: "The Soviet Union and the DPRK held the third meeting between working teams for Soviet-Korea economic cooperation in the Soviet Far East last August in Vladivostok.

The two sides were satisfied over the outcome of their mutual cooperation and agreed on continuing a series of joint projects such as growing of vegetables and soy beans under the supervision of the Korean specialists; producing of garments in the DPRK plants with materials supplied from the Soviet Union; and having the Korean workers build a series of plants and houses in the Primorskiy Kray.

They also discussed the need to expand cooperation in the area of fisheries even further.

To be a little more specific about agriculture, it must be noted that the union of farmers and industrialists in the Primorskiy has successfully continued cooperation with the state farm administration department under the DPRK Agricultural Commission for well over four years.

The Korean farmers have been successful in their work in the three state farms in Primorskiy Kray and we would not refuse to accept assistance from the Korean farmers well known for their industriousness and discipline.

We have also unfurled great prospect for cooperation in the area of fisheries. Where the Korean side supplied to us 10 tons of seaweed for canned food last year, this year we expect the supplies of sea weed to grow by 50 percent.

A specific study of the possibility of setting up a joint venture to process fish in the territory of the DPRK is under way. The rules to govern the management are as follows:

The Soviet side supplies part of the facilities and raw materials, while the Korean side is supposed to build the production facility, including warehouse, and manpower.

The production complex [name indistinct] also cooperates with the DPRK in the area of shipbuilding according to government-to-government agreement. We are satisfied with the quality of the ships being built in Korea, including small motor boats, tow boats, and boats for fishing in the coastal waters.

As recently as a few years ago, we have had the Soviet freighters and small trawlers repaired in the DPRK. However, this type of cooperation has become unprofitable for the Soviet fisheries industrial enterprises. It is because the settlement of payment based on the currencies of the two countries [word indistinct].

In my opinion, a joint venture for the production of sea urchin eggs which has been in existence for three years already in [name indistinct] is very interesting.

The founder of the enterprise is the union of fisheries cooperatives in Primorskiy Kray and a Korean trading company Korea Fisheries. Only about 10 tons of [name indistinct] were supplied to the Soviet market during last year's summer season.

Even the Korean construction workers are doing well in the Primorskiy Kray. [name indistinct] is building dwellings and living and cultural facilities in Primorskiy Kray.

We have recently marked the 30th anniversary of signing the USSR-DPRK treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance.

We celebrated this anniversary with good results. We will not remain satisfied with what we have achieved. We have many more untried potential for expanding the cooperation."

Further on Fishery Agreement

SK1707115391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1330 GMT 11 Jul 91

[From the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] Station reporter (Yakovskiy) talks about the cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK in the area of fisheries.

Our two countries have long continued effective cooperation in the area of fisheries.

Actively participating in cooperation as such are fishermen from the Crimea peninsula, southern part of the Soviet Union, as well as enterprise workers from the area.

Let me cite a few examples. Workers at [name indistinct] machinery plant have sent a large quantity of fish net repairing (?equipment) to the DPRK. The fish net repairing equipment enable the Korean fishermen to repair [word indistinct] nets and other equipment directly aboard ships during the fishing operation.

The net equipment, (Nevod), is characterized by its high productivity, a simple way of operating it, and its convenience. This equipment is being exported to many countries. It also has won medals and citations in international exhibitions.

Within the framework of long-term government-to-government cooperation, the Soviet and Korean fishermen have conducted joint research in the area of fisheries, such as new fish farming method.

For example, scholars at [name indistinct] institute for fishery studies are conducting research on (?climatizing) edible seaweed brought from the DPRK [words indistinct] with their Korean colleagues in the Black Sea.

This signifies only the bottom end of the joint research projects. The scholars at the institute are expected to build a fish farms to grow other species, such as sea urchin, crab, and shells in the Black Sea in the near future.

Cultivation of seaweed and shells in a fish farm will be a major industry in the Black Sea in a few years. The produces from this farm are expected to be widely used in [name indistinct], pharmaceutical, and other local industries.

According to a suggestion by the (?oceanographers) of the two countries' scholars, [name indistinct] will be established in Crimea, the first of its kind in our country, for the purpose of (?processing) the seaweed.

DPRK's Proposal for ROK Talks Analyzed

SK1707115691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1100 GMT 12 Jul 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Pyongyang has proposed to Seoul the reopening of South-North high-level talks. The ROK supported this proposal.

Station commentator Kondratsyev writes the following:

"I would like to call to mind that three rounds of the South-North premier-level talks were held last year. The fourth round that had been slated for last February was broken down. Team Spirit 91, the military exercise that is annually conducted between South Korea and the United States, was the cause of the breakdown.

Pyongyang has invariably accepted this military exercise as a threat to the DPRK's security.

At any rate, the South-North high-level talks were not very productive. The two sides to the talks have maintained different positions on normalizing the situation on the Korean Peninsula.

While hoping for a summit meeting, the two sides have kept military and political confrontation in place. Which will prevail over which?

I think that there is hope for a peaceful settlement of the Korean peninsula. The two countries appear to realize that they have little to gain from the South-North [word indistinct] confrontation.

It is, therefore, delightful to know that Pyongyang has taken the initiative in proposing the resumption of the South-North talks. Our friends in North Korea [pukchoson] seem to have revised their stand on the (?situation) on the Korean Peninsula.

In my view, the DPRK's latest decision to apply for a UN membership proves this point.

The North has proposed that the South and North hold a pan-national meeting for peace and reunification on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of Korea's liberation from Japanese rule. I believe that Seoul, too, has taken a responsive measure.

For example, not only has Seoul welcomed the DPRK's decision to apply for a UN seat, but it will also do the same thing.

No Tae-u, president of the ROK, supported Pyongyang's proposal for reopening the South-North premier-level talks, but he also suggested that South and North discuss issues related to signing a peace agreement between the two sides.

This proposal should be discussed in great detail. Only such things as measures aimed at normalizing the situation on the Korean Peninsula can be welcomed. The South-North high-level talks are (?vital) and are in the interest of the entire Korean people.

This being the case, the decision to reopen talks this coming August is welcome."

Station commentator Kondratsyev concludes his commentary by saying: "I am convinced that only the Koreans themselves can reach agreement on settling all the issues on the Korean peninsula, including the most complicated issue of national reunification."

South Korea Licensed To Produce F-16 Fighters

SK1707082591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 9 Jul 91

[Text] Under license of the United States, South Korea is expected to produce 72 F-16 fighter-bombers.

After signing with South Korea a contract involving a large amount of money, the Pentagon has served notice to the U.S. Congress on the contract. This contract is expected to be fulfilled on a phased basis.

In the first stage, Seoul will purchase 12 aircraft of this description; assemble 36 aircraft in South Korea with parts supplied from the United States; and then produce the F-16 under U.S. license.

Gorbachev, Yeltsin To Meet ROK Opposition

LD1707175491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0225 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo, 17 Jul (TASS)—Kim Tae-chung, leader of the ROK's main opposition New Democratic Party, will visit the USSR, Germany, and Poland at the end of August, YONHAP reports on 16 July.

During his stay in Moscow, the ROK opposition leader plans to meet USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. He is expected to address Moscow State University students.

During a meeting on 16 July between Kim Tae-chung and ROK President No Tae-u, the opposition party leader requested the head of state give the government's support to his forthcoming visits.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Agreement Signed With Vietnam on Oil Extraction

LD1707182291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0603 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By correspondent Igor Shubin]

[Excerpts] Hanoi, 17 Jul (TASS)—An agreement between the Soviet and Vietnamese governments which was signed here on Tuesday [16 July] is called on to step up the mutual cooperation and effectiveness of the work of the "Vietsovpetro" joint Soviet- Vietnamese oil and gas extraction enterprise. It legally secures the transition of the leading Vietnamese oil and gas extracting enterprise toward full economic and finance independence which it started at the beginning of this year. The document was signed by B. A. Nikitin, first deputy minister of the oil and gas industry, and Phan Thah Liem, Vietnamese minister of heavy industry, Phan Van Khai, member of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the State Planning Commission, took part in the signing ceremony. [passage omitted]

Over the first six months of the year "Vietsovpetro" has already achieved positive results. The volume of the extracted oil exceeded 1.7 million tons, which is approximately 10 percent above the plan. In 1995 a total of six million tons of "black gold" is to be extracted. At present, crude oil which is extracted here is exported to the third world countries since Vietnam does not have the necessary equipment for oil processing.

Oil Extraction Increases

LD1607222691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0449 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By correspondent Sergey Blagov]

[Summary] Hanoi, 16 Jul (TASS)—Since the beginning of the year the Soviet-Vietnamese enterprise "Vyetsovpetro" which is extracting oil on the continental shelf of southern Vietnam, has extracted more than 1.7 million tonnes which is about 10 percent more than planned, according to 'NHAN DAN'. This has been made possible by the bringing into use of four new wells and a second central platform, which has raised the average daily extraction level to 10-12 tonnes. This year they are to more than double their extraction over last year's. In 1995 it is planned to extract 6 million tonnes. Even now every hour of work gets a return of about $70,000. Most of the crude oil is exported to third countries, since Vietnam lacks processing facilities. The enterprise intends to get a tanker with a carrying capacity of 150,000 tonnes by the end of the year.

Moscow Assesses Prospect of Cambodian Solution

BK1807043791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1230 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Today, 16 July, is the first day of the informal meeting of Cambodian parties in Beijing. In the end, is the solution to the Cambodian problem moving forward or not? Here are the views of our commentator Comrade (Aleksey Kondrachev).

For me, the process to solve the Cambodian problem is comparable to a car with Cambodian and foreign passengers in it and with a tire deeply stuck in a big hole. As the foreign passengers, in this case representatives of the UN Security Council [UNSC] five permanent members and representatives of the ASEAN countries, Cambodia's neighbors, are making efforts to push this car forward, the Cambodian parties themselves still have not yet decided to push the car from which side and into which direction.

At the informal meeting in Beijing, the warring Cambodian parties will search for an agreed formula on implementing the UN plan on Cambodia worked out last year in Paris. Without going into the details of this plan, we would just like to recall that the plan envisages a cease-fire, demobilization of all warring parties' troops, and general election in the country under UN supervision. In the interim period until a government is set up, the role of major ministries in Cambodia would also be carried out by the United Nations. The tripartite opposing Cambodian side agreed with all the points of the plan. The Phnom Penh side objects to them. In my view, this is not without reason.

Among Phnom Penh's objections is the disagreement over the dissolution of the Cambodian army without a clear guarantee on the dissolution of the Pol Pot/Khmer Rouge forces. Generally speaking, the issue of preventing the Khmer Rouge regime's return to the country, in my view, is a major objective of the Cambodian solution. If this issue can be solved, the solution to the Cambodian problem based on the UN plan would quickly move forward. Is there reason for optimism that the car of the Cambodian solution could get out of the big hole? In my view, there is.

First, the Cambodian parties themselves are adopting positions close to one another. Last month they agreed on a cease-fire and decided to stop receiving foreign weapons. Second, the external aspect of the solution is now better than before. I want to refer to the coming meeting in Beijing on 17 July of representatives from the UNSC five permanent members. They plan to meet directly with the Cambodian parties and assist in moving forward with the UN plan.

It is worth noting that Cambodia's neighbors support a cease-fire among warring Cambodian parties. A few days ago, Hanoi expressed readiness to stop military aid to Phnom Penh and not to allow its territory for supplying weapons to Cambodia. This readiness was previously expressed by Laos. On the readiness to stop supplying military aid to Cambodian parties, it has already been expressed by Moscow, Beijing, and Washington.

Finally, the third factor for building peace in Cambodia, in my view, is wisdom, because the Cambodian problem cannot be solved militarily. It seems that this truth is seeping through all parties which have been enemies for 12 years in Cambodia. Thus, the hope that these parties would be reconciled does have some ground, our commentator Comrade (Aleksey Kondrachev) concludes.

Maslyukov Departs for Visit to Malaysia

LD1707195991 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow July 17 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov flew from Moscow to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, today on a three-day visit.

During the visit, he will participate in the opening ceremony (on July 19) of a foreign ministers' conference of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations" (ASEAN), which includes Malyasia, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Brunei.

Maslyukov will meet the Malaysian prime minister and will hold talks with the deputy prime minister on Soviet-Malaysian relations, above all in the trade and economic sphere, and on key international and regional issues.

A senior diplomat with the Soviet delegation told TASS before the departure for Kuala Lumpur that the establishment of a dialogue between the USSR and ASEAN is a (?noticeable) Event in relations between the Soviet Union and the states in the region.

This will help raise Soviet relations with ASEAN to a higher level and promote the situation of stability, security and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region as [words indistinct] after Malaysia, Maslyukov will visit Indonesia.

Replying to greetings from Malaysian and Indonesian diplomats at Moscow's Vnukovo Airport, Maslyukov noted that the USSR attaches much importance to the dialogue between the Soviet Union and ASEAN.

"We have many common interests both in the political and economic spheres. Therefore, such a representative delegation goes to the region," he said. "I hope that our dialogue will develop."

Official Hopes ASEAN Relations Improve

LD1707171791 Moscow TASS in English 0949 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow July 17 TASS—The presence of a Soviet delegation at a conference of foreign ministers of the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is an important step towards the establishment of a specific dialogue between the USSR and the ASEAN.

Successful development of the Soviet Union's relations with this authoritative regional organisation and its member-countries (Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Brunei) will make it possible to upgrade these relations, believes Aleksandr Panov, chief of the Pacific and Southeast Asian Directorate of the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

In an interview to TASS on the eve of the annual conference of ASEAN foreign ministers opening in Kuala Lumpur on July 19 Panov emphasised that the invitation of a Soviet delegation to the meeting as an observer is viewed "very positively" in the USSR.

"This is undoubtedly a result of the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives of our leadership, of our changing policy in Asia". Panov believes that a guarded attitude to the Soviet Union in ASEAN countries has given way to a realistic understanding of the objective need for the Soviet Union's presence in the region as a stabilising factor.

The recent rapprochement between the Soviet Union and ASEAN countries determines the prospects for mutually advantageous cooperation in the solution of the most important political problems, in consolidation of peace and stability in the region.

Panov believes that a remarkable contribution to this process can be made by the presence of Deputy Soviet Premier Yuriy Maslyukov at the opening ceremony of the meeting and his negotiations with participants.

The summing up of the Soviet Union's attitude to the situation in the region and proposals for the development of cooperation will lend a specific content to the USSR's dialogue with ASEAN countries, Panov holds.

Panov summed up the Soviet Union's intention to look for ways to develop regional ties in the commercial, economic, scientific and technological areas as an indispensable part of such a dialogue.

Energy and ecology, the study of outer space and development of means of communications, the development of mineral deposits and of transport are just some areas for mutually advantageous cooperation.

The Soviet Union is for the establishment of confidence with all ASEAN countries and is striving to do its utmost to become a fully- fledged partner of ASEAN, Panov said.

Explosion Reported on Pacific Fleet Vessel

OW1807083991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] There was an explosion at 9 a.m. on Wednesday on the auxiliary vessel Izhora of the Soviet Pacific fleet. One person died and one more is in serious condition.

The fire was extinguished. The size of the damage is being defined. The procurator's office of the fleet has started an investigation.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Stolen Uranium on Sale in Maputo, Claims Paper

PM1507141691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by unnamed correspondent: "Fact or Fantasy? FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE on Theft of Soviet Uranium"]

[Text] Bonn—In a report by its Maputo correspondent, the newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE claims that uranium is being sold illegally on the black market in the Mozambique capital. It was supposedly stolen a few months ago from a Soviet ship in Maputo harbor. Since the "goods" were offered in packaged form, it is not clear, the newspaper goes on, whether it is uranium ore or enriched uranium.

The Mozambique security organs know about the illegal uranium trade and have supposedly already carried out a number of searches in Maputo, as a result of which one uranium dealer was arrested.

The FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE notes that according to FRG Foreign Ministry information the federal government is "maintaining contact with the Mozambique Government" in order to clarify the circumstances of this illegal trade. There is talk of hundreds of packages of five different types, filled with uranium. For a 45-kg pack resembling a film canister, dealers are asking $150,000, the German journalist reports. For a triangular package they are asking $180,000, and for a rectangular one—$70,000. "On all the boxes there are Cyrillic characters and radioactivity warning signs." According to the dealers, the correspondent explains, they are being bought "mainly by Israeli and South African merchants."

Western diplomats in Maputo, the newspaper goes on, believe that the uranium episode could have serious consequences for Mozambique. One German diplomat said that "if this is confirmed, the Mozambique Army might not receive German equipment that is destined for it." This refers to deliveries of military transporters from Germany, as well as to the doubling of FRG aid to Mozambique.

Maputo, the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE writes, is known for its black market and port thefts. Containers carrying whiskey worth hundreds of thousands of marks recently disappeared there on the way from Britain to South Africa. The whisky is now being sold by small market traders. On the Maputo black market foreigners can acquire driving licenses, passports, ivory, drugs, raw gemstones, and also weapons, the newspaper reports.

But uranium? That is not whiskey. Although the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE sensation, under the headline "Black Market in Uranium in the Streets of the Mozambique Capital," lacks proof and facts rather than references to anonymous informers, the subject is too serious. And since the story mentions a Soviet ship from which the uranium was allegedly stolen, urgent explanations are required from the relevant Soviet departments, primarily the Maritime Fleet and the Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry. If uranium which was for some unknown reason on a ship of ours in Maputo really was stolen, that is a major incident. Otherwise it is a question of a hoax, in which case it would be no bad thing for the esteemed FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE to give equally wide publicity to the fact that it was a false alarm.

Mozambican Minister Issues Denial

LD1607202391 Moscow TASS in English 1959 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By correspondent Boris Bogdanov]

[Text] Maputo July 16 TASS—Mozambique Security Minister Mariano de Araujo Matsinhe has denied reports that uranium allegedly stolen from a Soviet ship here, is being sold in Maputo.

Commenting on reports by the German FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE newspaper, he said his ministry had no such information.

According to the newspaper, uranium stolen from a Soviet ship, which visited the Mozambique capital several months ago was offered to the newspaper's correspondent, who visited Maputo recently. The newspaper writes that similar offers were made to a high-ranking U.S. official.

The British Broadcasting Corporation today also reported that containers with uranium have appeared on Maputo's black market. It said South Africans and Israelis have shown interest in the radioactive material.

The newspaper writes about "a fantastic amount of uranium, which has allegedly fallen into the hands of black marketeers—several hundred 45-kilogram containers. Each of them is being sold for 70,000 to 180,000 U.S. dollars," the newspaper writes. The newspaper did not write whether it was uranium ore or enriched uranium.

Quoting Mozambique journalists, the newspaper writes that local authorities searched Maputo and arrested a trader of the stolen radioactive material. According to the newspaper, the German Foreign Ministry held consultations with Mozambique on the issue.

Matsinhe said his ministry is taking steps to clarify the veracity of the rumours, spread by FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE. The article might have followed the emergence of "packages with some toxic substances of unknown origin", the minister said.

The minister did not exclude the possibility that the article is the result of activities by "certain circles wishing to undermine Mozambique-German relations".

A spokesman for the Soviet Embassy in Mozambique told TASS that he had no information about any radioactive substances stolen from Soviet ships in Maputo's port.

Ambassador Korneyev Denies Uranium Stolen

LD1607175191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] [No dateline as received]—Vladimir Korneyev, USSR ambassador in Mozambique, told journalists on

Tuesday that the reports about the theft of Soviet uranium "are most like a very unscientific fantasy". It is extremely difficult to believe in their plausibility, he said, adding that he has never heard of any Soviet ships with uranium on board visiting the shores of Mozambique. However, the ambassador said that the Soviet side is trying to check reports about the theft of radioactive materials and if any new facts emerge, they will be made public.

Trade Delegation Arrives in South Africa

LD1407201191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 14 Jul 91

[Text] A Soviet trade delegation arrived in Johannesburg today. It is the first group of Soviet trade officials to visit South Africa in the last decade. The president of the Chamber of Commerce, Vladislav Malkevich, who heads the delegation, has told journalists that over 10 days of stay in South Africa, trade agreements are to be signed with local chambers of trade and companies. He refused, however, to disclose the nature of deals, and said he had met people whom he did not know in the country unknown for him. However, observers feel that the ore mining industry might be one of the most probable cooperation fields.

Mining Agreement Signed With South Africa

LD1607151691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] South Africa and the Soviet Union, which together produce almost half the world's gold, reached a mining cooperation agreement on Monday hailed as an important breakthrough. The pact, signed by the South African Chamber of Mines and a visiting delegation from the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry, does not commit either side to any specific action. Naas Steenkamp, president of the Chamber of Mines, said the accord effectively ended barriers in the mining industry that had existed since the two countries broke off diplomatic relations in the 1950's. It could lead to an exchange of technology, equipment, and mining methods, he said. The Soviet Union supports a negotiated solution to South Africa's black-white conflict. The two countries this year agreed to establish low-level diplomatic ties.

Health Agreement Signed by USSR, EEC, Niger

LD1707210491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1630 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] A tripartite agreement has been signed in the capital of Niger, Niamey, among the Soviet Union, the EEC and the Republic of Niger on cooperation in the sphere of health services. The Soviet physcians are known to have been working fruitfully in Niger and many other African countries for a number of years free of charge. This time a new form of multilateral cooperation has been found. Under the agreement, the EEC is obliged to finance the Soviet physicians in Niger. The Government of Niger, on its part, is responsible for ensuring the working and living conditions for Soviet specialists. This agreement is the first experience of a multilateral international cooperation in the humanitarian sphere with the Soviet participation in the region.

TASS Correspondents Interview Namibia's Nujoma

PM1507115991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondents V. Korochantsev and A. Turbin: "Interview With Namibian President. Ensuring Stability"]

[Text] Windhoek, 7 Jul—Namibia's Government considers the guarantee of peace and stability to be the main achievement in the country's first year of independence, the republic's President Sam Nujoma said in an interview with TASS correspondents.

During the process of establishing peace and accord, which are invariable conditions for successful economic development, particular attention has been devoted to the national reconciliation policy, the head of state said. This means that we are leaving behind the sad pages in our history and should think about urgent problems rather than remembering former strife.

Plenty of skeptics doubt our sincerity and loyalty to democratic Namibia, the president noted. They are even claiming that the South-West African People's Organization will destroy the constitution and introduce a one-party system, seeming to have forgotten that it was we, with our majority in the Constitutional Assembly, who approved the concept of a multiparty democracy being incorporated in the fundamental law.

True parliamentary democracy has now been established in Namibia, S. Nujoma indicated. However, it must be improved tirelessly, by reinforcing democratic institutions. Opposition parties must realize that there is no point being in opposition for the sake of it. For its part, the ruling party should retain its sense of proportion when defending its case.

If Namibians had not supported the concept and spirit of reconciliation, the world would have suffered, we would all have suffered. The government's national reconciliaton course has saved the country from the agonies of revolt and devastation. This policy is designed to unite alienated social groups, irrespective of their being political, military, or social, into a single whole in order to boost the well-being of the whole people.

In conditions of national reconciliation our efforts are designed to ensure uninterrupted economic and social development, the head of state stressed. That approach culminated last year in a 2.7-percent increase in GNP and success in the fight against inflation. However, we have many problems and shortcomings and it will take time to accomplish all our tasks.

In foreign policy Namibia is committed to the principles of nonalignment, S. Nujoma stressed. One of its top priorities is to strengthen ties with members of the OAU.

S. Nujoma pointed to the successful development of Namibian-USSR relations and expressed his intention to continue to strengthen them in the interests of the peoples of both countries.

Donskikh-Led Delegation Ends Zimbabwe Visit

PM1207103591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Harare, 3 Jul—An official visit to Zimbabwe by a CPSU delegation headed by V.V. Donskikh, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Lipetsk Oblast RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Committee, has ended.

The CPSU representatives were received by Simon Muzenda, the republic's vice president and second secretary of the country's ruling Zimbabwe African National Union—Patriotic Front Party, who expressed support for the course pursued by the CPSU of preserving the Union and of solidarity with the South African liberation movements' struggle for independence. The leader of the delegation asked that greetings and wishes for success and prosperity be conveyed to the people of Zimbabwe on behalf of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Delegation Head Views Ethiopian Trip

OW1207081091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 11 Jul 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama;" following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Addis Ababa the national conference on the settlement of the Ethiopian problem has drawn to a close. Apart from the permanent members of the UN Security Council a Soviet delegation took part in it with non voting rights, headed by Vladimir Kazimirov, head of the African Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

The contacts the Soviet delegation had in the Ethiopian capital were fruitful and inspiring, Kazimirov told DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] reporter. The dialogue with representatives of all major political parties and organisations has borne out the Ethiopian leadership's intent to renew and broaden cooperation with the USSR. Last month Soviet experts were evacuated from Ethiopia following outbreaks to hostilities.

Answering the question of whether they would return Kazimirov said it all depended on the needs of the Ethiopian side and the specific terms of cooperation. Kazimirov pointed out the fact that commercial trade has until recently occupied only a small part in bilateral relations. Now, he said, the two sides have come to realize the need to transfer contacts onto a mutually beneficial basis. According to Kazimirov, following the resolution of the most pressing tasks the interim government of Ethiopia will table concrete proposals aimed at expanding ties with the USSR.

At the same time Kazimirov has warned against any illusions about fast changes saying time was needed for the situation in that country to return to normal and the establishment of steady trade. What is important, he concluded, was that the two sides have in earnest declared their readiness to secure this aim.

CPSU Secretariat Greets Cape Verde Party Congress

PM1507154191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[CPSU Central Committee Secretariat greetings message, date not given, "To the Fifth Congress of the African Party for the Independence of Cape Verde (PAICV)"]

[Text] We cordially greet the delegates to the Fifth PAICV Congress.

Soviet Communists make a high assessment of the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the PAICV, and are prepared to continue developing them.

We wish success to your forum, which is called upon to find ways to further strengthen Cape Verde's national independence, social development, and democracy under the new conditions.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat

East Europe

East European Perceptions of G-7 Viewed

PM1807085191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by F. Lukyanov: "London 'Summit' and the East European 'Troika's' Stance]

[Text] Budapest—The countries of Eastern Europe, and especially the so-called 'troika'—Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia—have their own, peculiar attitude to the conference of the leaders of the seven foremost Western industrial countries which has opened in London, and the Soviet President's speech there....

At first, as soon as it became known that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev had been invited to the meeting of the "G-7," and the meeting's key topic emerged—the West's economic collaboration with the the Soviet Union—the "troika's" reaction was extremely reserved, not to say guarded. The "troika" clearly perceived in this a certain threat to the continued influx of foreign capital into Eastern European countries, capital which, in the event of large-scale accords between the "G-7" and the Soviet Union might be diverted further East, thus bypassing Prague, Budapest, and Warsaw. An unasked question—why the West should be helping the Soviet Union more than them, the countries which have traveled much further along the road of democracy and market economy?—was constantly in the air to begin with in the statements of the three countries' ministers and politicians.

The idea was expressed that the leaders of the "troika" should also take part in the London conference and ask for questions of the West's economic collaboration not only with the USSR, but also the countries of Eastern Europe, to be discussed. And to avoid any misinterpretation, Prime Minister J. Antall of Hungary officially declared about two weeks before the London conference that he would accept an invitation to the British capital with pleasure. However, no invitations were sent to Budapest, or Warsaw, or Prague, although similar appeals were heard from there. But not even that dampened the "troika's" hopes for a meeting with the "G-7:" People in the three East European capitals are still hoping, and not without reason, that assistance to the whole of Eastern Europe would also be discussed in London.

In order to somehow strengthen this hope, the Hungarian Premier paid a lightning visit to the FRG, where he met with Chancellor H. Kohl, literally on the eve of the summit. The latter somewhat reassured his guest by telling him that a plan for concrete financial assistance to the Soviet Union was not being drawn up in London. After the talks in Germany J. Antall told journalists that H. Kohl had personally taken on the task of representing Hungarian interests at the London meeting and had assured Hungary that support for the USSR would not be to the detriment of assistance to the countries of Eastern Europe, and the "troika" in particular.

In an article which appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES a day before the London meeting, President V. Havel of the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] proposed to the West that it open its markets to goods from the "troika" and offer Moscow credits with the condition that part of them would be used to pay for export goods from the three East European countries.

The final flourish was an urgent appeal to the "G-7" on the opening day of the conference in London. The appeal contains an urgent request, beside the assistance to the Soviet Union, not to forget the Eastern European countries' economic problems. Will these appeals have any effect on the results of the London conference? There are many conjectures on this account, especially in the Hungarian press. Frankly speaking, for the time being, reserved, not to say pessimistic, forecasts prevail. "Let's be realistic," NEPSZABADSAG wrote in this context. "The London summit may produce a spin-off for Hungary, but it would be futile to pin any great hopes on this." "If the USSR is offered assistance, Eastern Europe will get no more than crumbs. Would it not be better therefore to hope for a development of trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union?" NEPSZBADSAG concludes.

Bogomolov on Eastern Europe, Soviet Reforms

AU1707075691 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 12 Jul 91 p 6

[Interview with Soviet academic Oleg Bogomolov by Tibor Kis in Prague; date not given: "Domestic Conditions Are Also Necessary for Credits"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] Oleg Bogomolov is an adviser to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, and he is considered to be one of the most eminent economic specialists on the former socialist countries. For a long time, he headed the research institute that studied the economic problems of the so-called socialist world system. By now, the academic profile of this institute has changed a great deal, and it spends an increasing amount of time on issues related to the drafting of Soviet reforms. Nevertheless, the institute has not completely lost sight of former socialist countries. Our correspondent in Prague interviewed Bogomolov during a large international conference.

[Kis] Which problems do you consider to be of primary importance for the former socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe?

[Bogomolov] There are several problems, and they are completely evident in the economic sphere. The drop in production and the fall in living standards are particularly striking, as are the great burdens borne by society and the decline witnessed in foreign trade. Taken together, these problems also constitute a source of political tension. The main question that needs to be answered in connection with this is: What was it that really caused these difficulties? Why is the transition to a market economy so problematic? This is an exiting academic question because there have been examples of market reforms that have not started with a dramatic fall in living standards or confusion in the country's domestic situation, market reforms that—on the contrary—have led to immediate results.

[Kis] Economic and trade cooperation with the Soviet Union has collapsed—to what extent do you think that this factor has contributed to the development of the current situation?

[Bogomolov] This factor has had a particularly negative effect on Hungary and the CSFR. It is a fact that the system of relations that developed within CEMA was rather one-sided in the old days. Difficulties in the Soviet economy lie at the root of many of the problems that Eastern Europe is facing today. We only need to refer to the decline in trade, the decrease in energy and commodities transports, and to the fact that, due to a shortage of hard currencies, the Soviet Union is incapable of purchasing necessary goods from the countries of Eastern Europe.

[Kis] Do you see any solutions to this depressing situation?

[Bogomolov] Naturally, there are some possible solutions. On the one hand, it is true that we cannot really compensate for the damage caused by the drop in Soviet production—primarily the drop in crude oil exploitation. In this area, we are faced with a fait accompli: The drop in crude oil exploitation inevitably affects the total volume of our exports, no matter how we try to make up for it. However, there are also other kinds of problems, including the losses incurred through our trade and accounting mechanism. For example, we can ask ourselves whether the transition to hard currency trade and accounting at world market prices was a step taken too rashly and without due consideration. Now, it is in the context of a large-scale recession that we have to find ways of making the accounting mechanism acceptable, ways of climbing out of these artificially created difficulties.

[Kis] How do you think that bilateral trade relations could be brought out of their current deadlock?

[Bogomolov] There are several possible solutions. For example, we could perhaps use a clearing system that would work within the framework of a specific bank.

[Kis] Do you think that the higher echelons of the countries concerned devote enough attention to fundamental questions of economic and trade cooperation?

[Bogomolov] Unfortunately, I do not think so. I think that domestic problems or issues related to arms reductions have taken quite a lot of attention away from other problems, and a sort of vacuum now surrounds these other problems. This vacuum should definitely be filled somehow. Incidentally, Boris Yeltsin's visit to the CSFR (in his capacity as President of Russia) can be seen as an attempt to draw attention to problems that we can hardly ignore in the long run.

[Kis] The countries of our region have simultaneously started competing for Western support. What role do you think this Western help could play in the process of domestic change?

[Bogomolov] I think that efforts primarily have to be made on a domestic level. I do not think that Western help plays a determining role, at least not in the Soviet Union. Let there be no misunderstanding: We underline the importance of an integration of our economy into the world economy, and we stress that the West could further this process.

At the same time, I would not overestimate the significance of this assistance. This factor should definitely not be underestimated from the point of view of speeding up our domestic transition, and we will need this help as soon as our domestic conditions allow us to receive it. What am I referring to? If assistance is spent on the importation of consumer goods, our debts will increase. However, if our country really does devote itself to a serious market transition and democratic reforms, then large-scale Western assistance will be constructive and useful, in my opinion. If we want this help to be efficient, then the center and the republics have to agree on our future state structure. Indeed, at the moment, it is the center that receives credits, but it is the republics that have to account for the use of these credits. Furthermore, the credits granted to the center might promote structures that will probably have to be discontinued in the future, or structures that will probably die out anyway.

[Kis] Was your institute involved in the drafting of the new Union treaty?

[Bogomolov] Not directly, no. Naturally, we tried to draw the attention of the people working on the document to the handling of similar issues in other countries, like the SFRY or the CSFR.

[Kis] What is your personal opinion on the Nine plus One treaty?

[Bogomolov] I have a positive opinion of it. I think that this is a step in the right direction. Naturally, the real test will come in practice. There are still some gray areas in the document, and a lot depends on the consistency with which the individual instructions in the treaty are taken into account.

Reportage on Yugoslavia Conflict

91UF0974A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 91 p 1

[By A. Baturin and S. Gryzunov under the rubric "In Short": "Yugoslavia: The Latest Reports"]

[Text] Ljubljana-Belgrade—The first hours of the independent existence of Slovenia and Croatia have turned into tragedy.

At the order of the central government, subunits of the Yugoslav People's Army (YuNA) took control of state borders on the territory of Slovenia. This gave rise to a series of clashes with militarized detachments of the "Slovenian Guard." Especially important targets were guarded by tanks and armored personnel carriers. There were dead and wounded on both sides.

There was an even more difficult situation in Croatia, where about 600,000 Serbians live. The incidence of armed clashes increased between Croatian police and Serbian detachments of volunteers who are conducting, in essence, a partisan war—terrorist acts, blowing up of railway lines, etc. And there have been many victims there. Residents of Serbian nationality, fearing persecution by the Croatian authorities, are fleeing Croatia and traveling to Serbia or crossing the Danube into Vojvodina.

The highest federal and republic-level organs have been in constant session all these days, but so far without any result. While those in power continue to meet, the opposition parties prefer to act. The mobilization of Serbian volunteers and the formation of a Serbian national army have been declared. The Serbian Revival Movement (SPO) has promised to supply 100,000 "patriots" under arms.

Events in Yugoslavia are constantly on the front pages of the world's newspapers. Unfortunately, the news is bad. The conflict is increasingly taking on the features of a civil war. Antitank missiles and air defense weapons are already being used. The latest reports state that in the area of the Slovenian city of Rozhna a helicopter of the Yugoslav People's Army was shot down and the entire crew died.

Are the central authorities of Yugoslavia and the leadership of Ljubljana and Zagreb wise enough to halt the bloodshed? For the time being there is no common desire for a compromise. Negative emotions prevail, which may cost too many lives.

Shevardnadze on UN Role

LD1707090291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1928 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, July 16 (TANJUG)—What Yugoslavia needs is the international community's 'active mediation', together with a considerably greater engagement of the mechanisms of the United Nations, former Soviet foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze said in Moscow this evening.

This would help the federal and republican leaderships find a way out of the difficult situation in which the country finds itself, Shevardnadze said, speaking at a ceremony to launch his book Moi Vybor (My Choice).

He emphasized that the events in Yugoslavia were the affair of its peoples and that problems should be dealt with through talks. He declared himself against suggestions in the form of ultimatum which Yugoslavia has been receiving.

Talks Continue on Troop Withdrawal From Poland

OW1707055991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Diplomatic Panorama feature transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Another round of talks on withdrawing Soviet troops from Poland took place in Warsaw on July 9 and 10.

On the whole the talks were constructive, said the chief Soviet negotiator Valentin Kopteltsev. The two sides, he told DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent, discussed the key issues connected with determining the timing and stages of troop withdrawal. The two delegations also considered property issues and the problem of transit for the Soviet troops leaving the former GDR. At present, the diplomat said, the two sides are engaged in preparations for their next meeting to be held in Moscow on July 23.

Situation After Pullout From CSFR Viewed

PM1707104991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent Andrey Krushinskiy: "A Vacuum or a Cordon Sanitaire?"]

[Text] Prague—From time to time the word "final" crops up in publications on the theme of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia. Last December the final military unit stationed on Slovak territory was given its sendoff. In January the final warplane of the Central Group of Forces left. Then it was the turn of the final tank, the final troop train, and the final soldier.

The "final soldier" was a general. Colonel General Vorobyev, former commander of the now nonexistent Central Group of Forces, left for home 27 June, leaving not a single Soviet servicemen in Czechoslovakia (aside from the military attache service).

The official farewells were conducted with due decorum in a spirit of mutual benevolence. Before departure Vorobyev was received by CSFR President Vaclav Havel and Federal Assembly Chairman Alexander Dubcek. Words of gratitude were expressed to the general for the cooperation in the withdrawal of the troops.

But there were also, so to speak, unofficial ceremonies. For example, a rock concert in honor of the "occupiers' retreat" at which one of the singers was Michal Kocab, head of the parliamentary commission to observe the Soviet troop withdrawal (by profession he is a stage performer).

There were also appeals to inaugurate an "End of Occupation Day" at the end of June.

But is the term "occupation" appropriate in this situation? The question is not as simple as it may seem to many. Even though the action mounted by five Warsaw Pact countries in August 1968 cannot be called anything other than the invasion of a sovereign country, the Soviet troops did not leave as occupiers. Local inhabitants gave them a generally amicable farewell.

Yes, there is food for thought for the historians here. After all, the raison d'etre of the Central Group of Forces (leaving aside the precise background to its appearance) was not the control of Czechoslovakia but the joint protection with its army of our defensive alliance's forward frontiers. In other words, the same purpose as that of the U.S. Army in countries neighboring Czechoslovakia. And the triumph of the new political thinking found expression this time not only in the righting of the injustice done 23 years ago but in the ceremonial repudiation of bloc policy and of armed confrontation.

I realize that the debate on the theme of "occupiers or non-occupiers" could go on forever. I anticipate my opponents' objections: 1968 is a fact which cannot be deleted from history. But 1989 and 1991 are facts too! The question is: Which is more just and reasonable with regard to the future? Especially when, coincidentally, operation "withdrawal" was completed at almost the same time as a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee held here in Prague to mark the official disbandment of the alliance.

The term "vacuum" is appearing increasingly often in the local press and politicians' speeches now. To be honest, it causes me a certain amazement. What is there to worry about? Is it not evidence of an inner conflict when someone relishing the removal of the Central Group of Forces and the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact simultaneously complains about the consequent "void" forming in the system of ensuring security. What about Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland—how do they exist? Has someone threatened them over the last 45 years? Who is threatening the CSFR and against whom would it like collective guarantees?

What some politicians think, journalists sometimes say. Here is what the "independent newspaper" STUDENTSKE LISTY writes: "The withdrawal from implacable totalitarian positions in the central European countries was a calculated move by the Soviets to obtain Western investments and credits to modernize their empire. Meanwhile their military strength has remained absolutely intact and the KGB's international influence in the former socialist satellites has not declined and, since the Persian Gulf war has actually been increasing... The most appropriate thing is to forge the closest contacts with NATO, which in the past 42 years has managed to serve as the West European countries' reliable guarantor against traditional Russian expansionism in the mantle of international bolshevist ideology... Greater activeness should be expected from parties which have designated themselves right-wing and whose grandiloquent program statements advocate Czechoslovakia's participation in NATO."

You may object that this is no more than an extremist outburst unworthy of attention. And that the current Czechoslovak leaders have repeatedly stressed their interest in good mutual relations with our country. And it should be recalled that in an interview with me on the eve of the New Year CSFR Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier said: "...We want identically equal relations with all states. We are interested in good relations with the Soviet Union—with the center, the republics, and with people." Here in Czechoslovakia, unfortunately, the USSR, it seems to me, is not in an equal position. In the six months since then, the Soviet Union has completed the withdrawal of its troops and, not without difficulty for its own economy, has ensured uninterrupted supplies to the Czechoslovak economy of its minimum oil needs. But what changes have there been in Czechoslovakia since then? A tank—a monument to Soviet soldiers—has been defaced and removed from its pedestal. At the same time as Western (primarily FRG) television programs are being broadcast round the clock here the Czechoslovak TV leadership, on the pretext of the CSFR's switch to "summer time," has closed the last small window of objective information from the USSR—it has stopped relaying the "Vremya" program. Soviet newspapers are not bought here (unlike Western ones) and the only information on our life and on the processes taking place in our country that Czechs and Slovaks get comes from their own newspapers, for which the main thing often is to light upon an ill-formed thought from one of our military men or to unearth some "compromising material."

I could cite other examples. For example, contacts between the Czechoslovak Army and the Soviet Army have effectively been terminated whereas reciprocal visits by prominent Defense Ministry officials and parliamentarians to the Pentagon and the headquarters of the Bundeswehr and NATO are enjoying a boom. Whereas a few months ago local leaders said that Czechoslovakia is "seeking non-bloc cooperation, integration from San Francisco to Vladivostok, and the elimination of the structures that divide Europe," now they are campaigning for the retention of NATO and the maximum permissible ties with that bloc.

"Maximum permissible"—because the leaders of that bloc themselves are letting it be known that the entry of the East European countries into NATO—at least at the present stage—is undesirable.

This opinion dominated in particular the conference on the future of European security held recently in Prague. LIDOVE NOVINY asked W. Taft, U.S. permanent representative on the NATO Council and one of the conference participants, a direct question: Will it not be advantageous to the NATO countries if some sort of cordon sanitaire exists between them and the Soviet Union? The "cordon sanitaire" idea is an element of the confrontational understanding of security and does not ensure a satisfactory basis for long-term stability, the U.S. politician replied. But the journalists still wanted to find some link with the North Atlantic pact: If "formal membership ties" with NATO are presently not on the agenda for the Central and East European countries, they asked, could they be in the future? Taft did not rule that out. "From time to time we must evaluate the situation and if we come to the conclusion that this would increase our security and yours, we would have to be ready to consider that word," he said.

Is there not some hidden blackmail in this? Is the Central European vacuum not becoming a means of pressuring the USSR and of interfering in its internal affairs?

Finally, is it not safer for Czechoslovakia and its neighbors if the vacuum remains a vacuum? The Prague newspaper SHPIGL [name as transliterated], commenting on the problem of preparing a draft new Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty, writes: "Had it ever come to war between the USSR and NATO, then, given the arsenals that the great powers possess we, as a frontline state, would have had no chance of survival. However, the Soviet Union does not threaten NATO today. Nor does it threaten independent Czechoslovakia. Or is someone going to claim the opposite? Indeed, does someone stand to gain from sowing fear and hatred?"

It seems to me that a vacuum in present-day conditions does not pose a danger in itself. Furthermore, it would not be bad if such a vacuum (without blocs or foreign soldiers) spread to other states and the whole world. A historic mission has fallen to the central and East European countries—that of showing the world that it is better to live outside a bloc than inside. And of offering the NATO countries a good argument to show that they should follow the Warsaw Pact's example and disband their military organization.

West Europe

Report on German Plane Intrusion

OW1807065991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As we reported earlier, on Tuesday at about 21:00 Moscow Time 2 fighter planes and a helicopter belonging to Leningrad's air defence base forced a light aircraft of the M-20 type piloted by a German citizen to land in the "Pulkovo" airport.

As IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent learned on Wednesday from the air defence center of the Leningrad military district, the aircraft took off from Helsinki on Tuesday, violated the route of an international airline and failed to react to the signals given by Leningrad's air defence center. Because of clouds the interceptor planes and helicopter could not approach the trespasser aircraft. They followed it at a distance till it landed in Pulkovo.

Investigations have revealed that the air traffic controller at Helsinki's airport failed to inform the nearest Soviet airport about the aircraft in question since he was overloaded with other work.

Response Lauded

PM1707201591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by V. Litovkin: "Air Defenses Work Efficiently"]

[Text] The Leningrad "600 Seconds" program and TASS reported that an M-20 aircraft belonging to a private individual from the FRG completed a flight from Helsinki to Leningrad on 16 July, escorted by two fighters and a helicopter of the Air Defense Forces, having contravened the regulations for crossing the USSR State Border.

Colonel B. Korolev, duty officer at Air Defense Forces Central Command, told the editorial office that a twin-prop M-20, an aircraft somewhere between an An-24 and an Il-14, had been making a routine international flight in the official Helsinki-Pulkovo corridor. It was supposed to have had six to seven passengers on board.

According to international regulations, 50 km from the USSR state border it should have made contact with the flight controller at Pulkovo Airport and identified itself. But the aircraft was flying at a height of approximately 500 meters and it had a weak radio set, so it was unable to make contact.

Leningrad Zone Air Defense Forces facilities were following its flight. And, because it did not respond to the "friend or foe" request and violated the state border, a MiG-23 fighter was scrambled from a military airfield. It escorted the M-20.

Soon after crossing the state border the pilot of the M-20 managed to contact Pulkovo flight control and landed at the airport exactly on schedule.

He had not deviated from his route. He had behaved properly in the air. Our fighter received a command not to act against the intruder and to return to its own airfield once the latter had landed.

"Cases such as the one that occurred in the vicinity of Pulkovo," Boris Petrovich said, "are nothing remarkable as far as the Air Defense Forces troops are concerned. Similar violations occur several times a day all over the country. One reason for that is because international air traffic control is not yet properly organized."

We can only rejoice that on this occasion the Air Defense Forces operated impeccably and efficiently. Let us hope that will continue to be the case.

EC's Delors Discusses Soviet Reform

LD1707221191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 2020 GMT on 16 July, as its regularly scheduled "Topical Interview" program, carries an 18-minute recorded interview with EC Commission President Jacques Delors by correspondent Kipras Mazheyka in Delors's Brussels office, conducted in French with superimposed Russian translation. The date of the interview is not given.

Delors opens the interview by reviewing the EC's current assistance to the Soviet Union, in the form of food and other goods. He discusses technical assistance to modernize Soviet industry and a European energy charter proposed under the terms of the CSCE's Paris Charter.

At 2028 GMT, Mazheyka asks Delors to comment on the "centrifugal processes to which the USSR is being subjected" in light of the "completely new, federative formation," to which Delors replies: "There are several possible models. Any one of them must correspond to the choice of Soviet people themselves. The disintegration of old structures is beginning, structures which have outlived their usefulness, as is happening now in the USSR, Yugoslavia, and a number of other countries. In other words, they are ineffective. But, even in this case, there are certain minimum conditions without which it is impossible to solve the main tasks as a whole: to achieve real independence and to improve the people's standard of living. I count the following among these minimum conditions: common banknotes, regulated coordination of national economic development and of the republics' policies, common defense and a common foreign policy, and the same concepts for protecting and guaranteeing human rights. There are several possible options for implementing such minimum conditions; without them, I fear very much that there will be nothing but anarchy and disorder. Alas, that is what we are seeing in the Soviet Union now, as a side-effect of the main changes. I have had quite a few discussions on this subject with the Yugoslav leaders of the six republics. I expressed the same ideas there, in Belgrade: Only if that minimum is observed will you be able to achieve the desired goal, but if you neglect it, if you do not respect legitimate human rights, if you violate the principles of pluralism and democracy, you will not get anywhere, although discussions will continue endlessly. You will be a shortsighted politician as far as your people's aspirations are concerned, for you will be leading them up a blind alley. Consequently, nobody but the Soviet people themselves is entitled to decide whether there should be more centralization or less or whether more or fewer rights should be granted to local and republican authorities. With all the options, minimum conditions must be maintained; without them, the chances of success are not great."

At 2038 GMT, Delors concludes the interview by commenting on the merits of a mixed economy, saying that the switch from a centralized economy to any other form is gradual and has never happened overnight.

French Welcome Visiting Warships to Toulon

PM1707111191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by S. Iyezuitov and V. Menshov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] The visit to the French port of Toulon by a detachment of Soviet warships has ended.

[Iyezuitov] The bay in which the French naval base is located is unique in that it is big enough to hold both the U.S. and Soviet fleets. On this particular day our Navy was represented by three ships—two large ASW ships (the Azov and the Krasnyy Kavkaz) and the Perekop training vessel. Everything was as you'd expect. There was a 21-gun salute and an band waiting on the quayside to greet the honored guests. And why not? The last such visit was 15 years ago, and just a few days ago saw the 100th anniversary of the first visit to France by Russian ships—again warships. After the ceremonies and the speeches things got busy for the seamen. The ships were literally overrun by local people, and special launches had to shuttle back and forth from the pier to the Soviet ships, which had temporarily turned into a kind of tourist attraction. Music was playing, Russian was being spoken, and people were signing the visitors' book in Russian—maybe with a few mistakes, but the sentiments were genuine. The sailors walked around the city, seeing the sights. The cautious look usually to be found in the eyes of Soviets abroad disappeared when our sailors saw the smiles of welcome on people's faces. And while local kids were being presented with badges back on deck, we turned our attentions to this gentleman. It turned out that he wasn't a sailor, just someone very interested in naval history—especially Soviet naval history—and had even written on the subject. What did he think of the visit? It's splendid, you should come again! That's what he said—simply and genuinely. And why not, indeed?

Supreme Soviet

Regional Groups Express Right to Union Membership

PM1707194391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

["Appeal to USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Having discussed the situation which has taken shape, we, the representatives of regions whose populations during the all-Union referendum (and local polls) unequivocally expressed their will to remain within a renewed USSR, declare:

These results have been obtained despite opposition from republic authorities which have sought in every way to thwart the work on the new Union treaty, banned the referendum, and declared themselves outside the Union, despite the procedure provided by the Law "On the Procedure for Republics' Withdrawal From the USSR." In order to stifle the expression of popular will, the republic authorities have resorted to the most varied methods of moral and physical terror.

The new draft Union treaty proclaims the right of newly established state entities to joint the Union. The selfsame right is reaffirmed also in a provision of the law "On the Procedure for Republics' Withdrawal From the USSR," and the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution adopted on the results of the 17 March 1991 all-Union referendum.

The correct application of the aforementioned provisions makes it possible effectively and on a legal basis to resolve the most acute questions of interethnic and interrepublic conflicts and to overcome the difficulties in the path of the establishment of a renewed Union.

These declarations have not, however, been backed up by a corresponding mechanism for their implementation, and this is fraught with a threat to civic peace and interethnic accord, not just in our regions but also in many other areas.

In view of the aforementioned circumstances, we insist on:

1. The people's will, as expressed in the referendum, being recognized as sufficient grounds for the admission of delegations from our entities to the signing of the Union treaty.

2. The establishment of a commission under the USSR Supreme Soviet which would be empowered to examine and resolve questions for which provision has been made under the aforementioned legislative acts.

On behalf of:
Dnestr Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—G.S. Marakutsa
Gagauz Republic—M.V. Kendigelyan
Abkhaz Autnomous Republic—T.M. Shamba
South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast—A.G. Chekhoyev
Estonian SSR's Interregional Council—Ye.V. Kogan
Lithuanian SSR's Salcininkai Rayon—K.J. Bilans

Panel Resolution on Employment Published

PM1607125591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On Progress in Implementing the Fundamentals of USSR and Republic Legislation on the Population's Employment"]

[Text] Having discussed information from the USSR minister of labor and social problems on the progress in implementing the Fundamentals of USSR and Republic Legislation on the Population's Employment, the USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees point out that direct-effect republic laws have been adopted in development of the fundamentals in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Kazakh SSR, the Belorussian SSR, and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, and similar laws have been prepared for examination by Supreme Soviets in a number of republics.

At the same time there is a lagging behind schedule (information is appended) in implementing the measures for the population's social support and protection from unemployment and for ensuring the population's employment, as envisaged in the fundamentals and in the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution of 15 January 1991 "On Bringing into Force the Fundamentals of USSR and Republic Legislation on the Population's Employment."

The USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees resolve:

1. The republic Supreme Soviets which have not adopted laws on the population's employment are to be instructed to accelerate their examination and adoption. Prior to the adoption of such laws the implementation of the measures for citizens' social protection envisaged by Section IV (social guarantees on loss of work) of the Fundamentals of USSR and Republic Legislation on the Population's Employment is to be ensured.

2. The attention of republic Supreme Soviets and governments is to be drawn to a failure to fulfill Article 22 of the fundamentals on participation in forming the Union Employment Fund to finance all-union measures for implementing employment policy and also to give assistance to individual regions in emergency situations.

3. Mindful of the fact that the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution tasks the USSR Government with taking measures to form, starting 1 February 1991, the State Fund to Assist Employment, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the USSR State Bank are to be instructed to resolve all practical questions of the functioning of this fund.

4. Mindful of the expected growth in the problem of the population's employment in the country, the USSR

president is to be asked to examine with the republics a package of questions for the joint implementation of employment policy.

5. The USSR Ministry of Labor and Social Problems is to be recommended to extend the practice of concluding contracts and agreements with USSR ministries and departments and with creative unions and other public organizations for the purpose of actively involving them in the creation of new jobs with a view to ensuring the population's employment.

6. The USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees put to the republics' Supreme Soviets and governments and to trade unions the proposal:

—to complete the preparation of agreements between the USSR and the sovereign republics on mutual obligations in the sphere of implementing social programs and ensuring USSR citizens' social guarantees for 1991-1992, and to sign them;

—to increase attention to questions of forming a system of professional training and of retraining and raising the qualifications of working people who are released and the unemployed population, and to prevent the closure or sale of professional educational institutions and also any use of such institutions at odds with their direct purpose.

7. USSR people's deputies and people's deputies of republic and local soviets are to be asked to give assistance and help to executive organs of local power, to employment services, to statistics organs, and to labor collectives in the practical implementation of legislation on employment and the population's protection against unemployment.

8. Suggestions and criticisms submitted in the process of discussion are to be sent for examination and for the adoption of measures on them, and the authors and commissions are to be notified of the results.

9. It is to be deemed necessary to hear the question of the progress in fulfilling this resolution in November 1991 at a joint session of the commission and committees with representatives of the republics.

10. This resolution is to be published in the press.

The resolution was signed by the chairmen of the Commission for Labor and Social Policy, the Committee for Legislation and Law and Order, the Committee for Economic Reform, the Committee for Industry and Energy, the Committee for the Affairs of Women and of Family and Demographic Policy, the Committee for the Protection of the People's Health, the Committee for Youth Policy, and the Commission for Economic Relations of Republics and Autonomous Formations.

IZVESTIYA Reports Union Treaty Debate

PM1707124191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 Union Edition pp 1, 2

[Parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev report from the Kremlin: "Draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States Backed"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] After a report by R. Nishanov, member of the Preparatory Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, on the draft treaty on the Union of Sovereign States at the 11 July sitting, the debates were opened. They opened with a speech by Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order.

The Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order examined the draft Union treaty and gave it a positive evaluation. Yu. Kalmykov said: We proceed from the fact that, as a result of the laborious and extensive work carried out by the preparatory committee, the document is at the stage where the question of signing the Union treaty can be raised. Nevertheless, there are a number of fundamental points and aspirations which will have to be taken into account during future work on the document.

First. We all pin high hopes on the Union treaty in the sense that once it is signed the "war of laws" will end. But here there are certain clauses which in my opinion will stimulate the "war of laws." Above all, this issue concerns Article 11 which states that the republics and the Union are entitled to unilaterally suspend laws as follows: The republics can suspend the enforcement of Union laws on their territory, and the Union can suspend the enforcement of a republic law if it does not correspond to the constitution and laws of the republic on the one hand, and of the Union on the other.

If we preserve this wording we will never escape the "War of Laws," since unilateral suspension is always the result of a subjective evaluation of a law's quality. We have a Constitutional Court, conciliatory commissions are envisaged, and a supreme parliamentary chamber is being set up—the Soviet of the Republics, which will adopt the fundamental laws. So what are we afraid of? A republic may have doubts—let us say it appeals against a Union law. It must appeal to the conciliatory commissions and set the conciliation procedure in motion. And if in this instance no agreement is reached, the matter is handed over to the Constitutional Court. The decision of the Constitutional Court is final.

Second. Article 6 deals with joint competence. What exactly is that? It probably implies that the Union and the republics must achieve accord on the issues listed in this article. But how can this be translated into law? You know, every decision is transformed into law. I think that accord must also be reflected in the Fundamentals which the Supreme Soviet is adopting, and in the codes and laws adopted in accordance with these Fundamentals.

Third. Article 8 of the draft concerns "Ownership." In fact, it does not provide for Union ownership.

Yu. Kalmykov stressed: If we recognize the Union as a federal sovereign state, then how can it manage without property? Every sovereignty presupposes the existence of an economic basis. That economic basis is its own property, its own assets. Otherwise such sovereignty is worth nothing. Therefore, in all federal states it is assumed that there is federal ownership and that it is secured in law. If we opt for the path outlined in this law, then tomorrow one of the republics could say: "Give us our share of the property, the military equipment, the country's nuclear potential...."

Deputy A. Boyko continued the discussion: When examining this question, it is necessary above all to take due account of three important circumstances. The Union as a state—as a single economic, social, and living space—is our greatest asset and it must not be lost under any circumstances. That is the first point.

Second. Historically, the Union has taken shape in such a way that any disruption of it will cruelly avenge itself. We already feel this. It would be good if the republics' political businessmen recognized this.

Third. The republics want to opt for the path of sovereignty, and, naturally, this reality cannot be ignored. There is no alternative today except to follow the path of the well-known Nine plus One statement and the proposed draft Union treaty.

Boyko stressed: Another option—the Yugoslav model—would be a disaster for our country. Therefore, we disagree with the view that the draft Union treaty can lead only to the collapse of the Union and not to its reinforcement. One thing remains: to recognize, respect, and—if you like—nurture the stated documents. That they have yet to be completed is another matter.

A. Boyko went on to analyze in detail certain shortcomings in the document. Especially in questions of an economic nature. For example, the draft treaty contains wholly acceptable norms, say, on a uniform monetary, finance, and credit system, a single pricing policy, a uniform customs procedure, banking system, and so on. You have to agree with this, and it should not be viewed as the center's usurping certain functions and trying to keep them for itself. The issue is about the joint exercise of these functions and coordinated activity by all republics to perform them. Here there is no infringement of the republics' economic rights.

The republics express a wish to erect customs fences along their borders (as opposed to a single customs service for the entire USSR), and to erect barriers against the shipment of goods across republic borders. The anticrisis program unequivocally demands that there should be no barriers for commodity producers shipping produce within the single economic space.

Despite the flaws in the draft in question, Deputy A. Boyko called for it to be approved and for its speedy signing to be facilitated. [passage omitted]

The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, its Chairman S. Alekseyev said, prepared an expert opinion on the draft Union treaty at the behest of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the whole, it considers this draft to be perhaps the most important, weighty, and significant phenomenon of recent times. For it is the basis of our constitution. Once signed, the Union treaty will become the core of the constitution.

It is an advanced document from the viewpoint of global civilization processes. It consolidates the formation of a civic society and the priority of human rights, and continues our social development.

At the same time, S. Alekseyev noted, the draft Union treaty is founded on a delicate compromise, it has imperfections.

First: One indispensable attribute of a state is its own financial base. Without its own taxes it is not a state. The issue here is not about resolving the question of what is best—a single-tier or a two-tier system. This is not a question of prestige or ambitions. If that is the argument, there will simply be no Union. There will be no Union as either a federation or a confederation. If it is built on contributions, it will be no more than an international UN-style legal entity.

Second aspect. The axioms of juridical science and legality are immutable effects of laws. And when the suspension of the law's effect at various levels began in our country, this was not simply a "war of laws." In fact it was polyarchy, which destroys a state and is essentially the outbreak of an (as yet bloodless) civil war. Here, S. Alekseyev agreed with Deputy Kalmykov: If we legalize the procedure whereby the Union can suspend republic laws unilaterally and the republics can suspend Union-wide laws unilaterally, then we legalize the conditions for civil war.

The third problem is linked with the fact that one immutable demand of a democratic state is the supremacy of the law and the elevation of judicial authority to the level of supreme power in the state. This can only be when judicial authority is sufficiently independent of the other authorities, all of which must stand equally. But perplexity is caused by the stipulation in Article 13 of the draft Union treaty that the Union Constitutional Court will be formed by the Soviet of the Republics, which is set up in general on an equal footing and even by appointment. I can say with utmost certainty that in this case we will not have a Constitutional Court. There will be a conciliatory commission. The Union treaty is the "bridge" which will stop us from falling into the abyss.

N. Pivovarov, chairman of the Committee for State Building, began his speech with a question: Am I satisfied with the draft of the new Union treaty? Frankly no, I am not satisfied. I find the proposed draft far from totally acceptable. But we must be realistic. After all, this document is built on accord between all republics. It is their first step toward realizing that the peoples living in our country share a common destiny.

In the last 18 months or two years, the system of soviets has undergone major changes. Specifically, clauses in the USSR Constitution on the monitoring of all state organs by, and their accountability to, soviets of people's deputies, through which the people exercise state power, have been transformed. Thus, the principle of soviets' sovereignty in the traditional sense is undergoing quite substantial changes. This has been greatly helped by instituting the presidential form of rule both in the Union and in the majority of republics. Given these changes in the form of government, our state is becoming a presidential-soviet republic, or a presidential republic of the soviet model.

A process of fundamentally new mutual relations in the system of state organs is underway. And N. Pivovarov believes that soviets of people's deputies at every level are once again having to fight for their place in this system.

Once we have affirmed the soviet nature of statehood, with due account of its new image and the possibilities for renewal, we will be able to achieve not just continuity in the development of state structures, but also the sovereignty of the people.

The further democratic development of the state, political stabilization, harmony in interethnic relations, and our country's extrication from a most profound social crisis dictate the need, on the one hand, to establish a new character in relations between the Union and the republics and, on the other hand, to create a powerful and effective socioeconomic base. To a large extent, the new draft Union treaty covers this task—this is the belief of M. Rakhmanova, chairman of the Committee on the Affairs of Women, the Family, and Demographic Policy. Its main substance concerns the demarcation of the Union and republic spheres of powers, which also defines the new style of relations between them, the recognition of the market nature of a single economic space, and the legal prerequisites for its formation. We have literally sprouted economic, cultural, political, and purely humanitarian links, she said. Some 75 million of our compatriots live outside their national territories. Migration processes are expanding. Finally, there has been a shift of social aims and of social values: We have declared that it is not the state but the individual that is in the center of today's policy. All this determines the need to pursue within the Union's framework a uniform state policy with regard to young people, women, the family, and veteransusing this policy as a basis for the elaboration of rational republic programs with established guarantees of uniform minimum social protection. Thus, the republics' approaches to social policy affecting basic human rights must be uniform and coordinated. But naturally, the ways to resolve this will be varied and it is the republics themselves which will determine them. [passage omitted]

G. Tarazevich, chairman of the Commission on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations, believes that the Union treaty has traversed a complex, difficult, indeed a truly thorny path, and this path is still not at an end. The draft was created in the process of coordination of interests, struggle between contradiction, and quest for compromise. During the discussion of the draft, the commission engaged in a fairly heated debate focusing on the following question: Is the draft in keeping with the principles of the new Union's federal structure? As we know, contemporary federal states lack restrictions and obstacles in economic and trade relations, in the free movement of capital and people. Our current practice and the legislation of certain republics contradict these principles. The draft Union treaty also fails to shed light on these questions. Therefore, in our commission's opinion, the treaty's preamble should highlight the need to preserve a single economic space as one of the aims of uniting the republics in a Union.

There is much argument around Article 13 on the USSR Supreme Soviet. Clearly, the said article requires substantial additional work, primarily with regard to the distribution of powers between chambers and the quota of representation in the Soviet of the Republics. A procedure for composing the Soviet of the Republics via direct elections by national-territorial electoral districts, and not via the delegation of republic representives to the said chamber by their supreme organs of power, would be more democratic.

When discussing political questions, we most often campaign among and try to persuade our own group. Meanwhile, public opinion is not sufficiently in line with what is happening in the supreme organs of power in the Union and the republics. In short, the people are unaware of the stance taken by those they have elected and consequently cannot influence their stance. Clearly, it is no accident that the referendum results, to put it mildly, do not quite correspond to what politicians do. I also have the work on the draft Union treaty in mind here. And in this connection I believe that in the final stage of the treaty process we must do everything possible to ensure this process progresses in an atmosphere of complete openness and glasnost. [passage omitted]

The Interregional Deputies Group believes, Deputy A. Sebentsov said, that it would be better to do some additional work on the draft Treaty, but that it can be signed. The draft is of an interim nature. It seeks a civilized transition to a renewed community, but it has clearly not proved possible to reach agreement on the nature of this community. The contradictory structure of a federation comprising sovereign states, which in turn incorporate other sovereign states, cannot be a stable option. And if not in the immediate future, then in the not so distant future these sovereignties will "blow up" the new community just as the constitutional norm on a nation's right to self-determination, including secession, has provided a legal foundation for the breakdown of the existing USSR.

The compromise that this document reflects may represent a phase in this quest.

We are speaking of a renewed Union, it is effectively a question of forming a new state. We were brought to this formulation of the question by the course of democratic transformations in the country, Deputy A. Yeliseyev began his speech. He suggested that the debate participants first determine their view on the following dilemma: Either we favor the center's making efforts to preserve the Union in what we consider to be the most correct form, or we agree that the republics themselves are capable of finding the most successful form of union. I think the second option most correct. That is why I support the actual idea of preparing and signing a new Union Treaty.

Needless to say, the overwhelming majority of people here would like all republics which make up the USSR today to be parties to the new Union. But a number of conditions must be observed in order for this to occur. It is important for the Union treaty to make provision for the kind of norms of life that would match the interests of every republic to the maximum. What is more, it is necessary to ensure that concentrating a series of functions in the center's hands is beneficial for each republic. We think that the authors of the draft treaty also endeavored to ensure this when drafting it.

Deputy M. Rakhimov, speaking during the debate, said that the Bashkir SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has at all stages invariably supported the hew Union Treaty's ideas and played an active part in preparing it, thus making its own contribution to the content of the treaty. The draft treaty on the whole accords with the Declaration of Bashkir SSR State Sovereignty and is in the republic's interests.

The draft treaty changes many of our notions of our country's national-state structure. The draft treaty resolves in a fundamentally new way the question of the founders of the Union and its subjects. The draft proceeds from the premise that sovereign states are subjects of the Union and renounces the division of republics into Union and autonomous republics. These provisions make it natural for all republics currently belonging to the Union to be parties to the treaty. We are convinced that this stance is correct.

Our confidence is based on the results of the all-Union referendum: Almost 85 percent of Bashkiria's voters advocated retaining the USSR and favored a Union of equal sovereign republics. We reckon that it was the referendum which paved the way for the Bashkir SSR to autonomously sign the Union treaty.

In this context, M. Rakhimov said, we cannot agree with the stance held by some Russian people's deputies who want to deny Bashkiria the right to directly sign the treaty and be an autonomous party to it.

We were also surprised by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolution of 5 July this year. In this resolution the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, without any coordination with us, incorporated the Bashkir SSR plenipotentiary delegation within the Russian delegation for the treaty signing and advanced the idea that the RSFSR, in conjunction with republics belonging to the RSFSR, is a composite subject of the USSR and will sign the treaty as a single state delegation.

I deem it necessary to state that these decisions by the Russian parliament are in direct contravention of documents previously adopted by it.

Deputy M. Safiullin drew his colleagues' attention to the problem of the status of the Republic of Tatarstan.

It is well-known, he said, that last August the Tatar SSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted a declaration on the republic's state sovereignty. This historic act expressed the will of the multiethnic people of Tatarstan for de facto and de jure equality within the family of peoples of the USSR. In the time since then the republic has done much to practically exercise state sovereignty both in economic life and in the political and spiritual spheres.

The deputy voiced regret that the central authorities, along with those in a number of republics, are trying, as it were, to disregard Tatarstan's sovereignty, while the central mass media either hush up events in the Tatar SSR or endeavor willy-nilly to present them in an incorrect light.

M. Safiullin is convinced that endeavors are being made to present Tatarstan's principled stance as destructive and precarious for the Union. That is ridiculous! It is a criterion for state territorial sovereignty, however one must not disregard the national component of sovereignty, the growing self-awareness of the Tatar people who, numerically, rank fifth among the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Tatarstan is willing to make its own contribution to setting up the renewed Union, stabilizing society by means of democracy and internationalism, and securing a fitting standard of living for the entire Soviet people. The multiethnic people of Tatarstan have the right to ensure that the Tatar SSR constitutes an equal republic among equals. Both Tatarstan and the Union as a whole stand to gain from this.

N. Feskov, secretary of the Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission, dwelt in detail on the role of credit and finance policy in the future Union and on the procedure for shaping the Union budget. By and large the commission reckons that the treaty must be signed today.

Deputy G. Fomenko is convinced that the Treaty is very necessary. Nevertheless a well-considered approach to all its provisions is also essential.

The state is not an end in itself but only the means to satisfying citizens' needs, Deputy V. Bushuyev, the next speaker, said. But citizens' needs cannot be reduced only to safeguarding their personal rights and freedoms. They depend to a considerable extent on how problems of citizens' well-being are resolved in conditions of today's very difficult food, housing, and other problems. That is why particular attention must be paid to these questions when finalizing the draft treaty.

First: In the draft we have failed to reflect the creation and functioning of a single economic space as one of our goals. We confined ourselves merely to a note about creating conditions for a Union market.

The second question is the very narrow understanding of security problems. It is high time that we realized that the problem of security is not a problem for the KGB and the Defense Ministry. To a considerable extent this problem is a problem of well-being, ecology, and a problem of technological security. That is why it is very important for the treaty to provide a clearer interpretation of such vital systems as the unified power grid, the oil and gas, transport, information, and a number of other systems, and questions of managing these sectors.

On the instructions of the 17 deputies' groups within the "Soglasiye" [Accord] Association, Deputy F. Burlatskiy expressed his firm support for the draft treaty.

He disagreed with what Deputies Alekseyev, Boyko, and Bushuyev said. Compared with international documents, the draft treaty leans heavily toward a confederation. However, from the political viewpoint, we must take reality into consideration. And the reality is that in this form the treaty plays a positive role in the consolidation of our Union and in the fight to preserve it.

A. Veprev, chairman of the Committee for Agrarian and Food Policy, gave a detailed account of agrarian deputies' position. At the end of his speech he handed over proposals on the draft Union treaty, addressed to the president. Agricultural production is so important that agrarian deputies deem it necessary to sign a separate protocol to the Union treaty on cooperation between the republics in the agro-industrial complex.

Deputy V. Semenov has prepared an alternative draft resolution on the Union Treaty in conjunction with his colleague V. Voskoboynikov, and submitted it for consideration by the Supreme Soviet.

On behalf of a group of deputies from territorial formations within the republics that have refused to sign the Union Treaty, Deputy Ye. Kogan read out a statement.

It says: "We representatives of regions whose populations unequivocally voiced their desire to remain with the renewed USSR in the course of the all-Union referendum and local polls, having discussed the prevailing situation, note as follows. These results were obtained despite opposition from the republic authorities who did their utmost to wreck work on the draft new Union Treaty, banned the holding of the referendum, and proclaimed themselves to be outside the Union despite the procedure envisaged by the USSR Law 'On the Procedure for Resolving Question Linked with a Union Republic's Secession from the USSR.' In order to suppress the people's will, the republic authorities resorted to various means of moral and physical terror.

"Second. The new draft Union treaty declares the right for newly created state formations to join the Union. This right is also reaffirmed by a clause of the USSR Law 'On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Linked with a Union Republic's Secession from the USSR,' along with the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution adopted in accordance with the results of the all-Union referendum of 17 March 1991.

"Third. Correct application of these provisions makes it possible to effectively and legally resolve all the most acute questions of interethnic and interrepublic clashes and overcome the difficulties in the way of creating a renewed Union. However, these declarations have still not been fortified with a corresponding mechanism for their implementation, entailing a threat to civic peace and interethnic accord not only in our regions, but also in many others. In view of these circumstances we insist on the following:

"First—to recognize the will of the people, as expressed in the referendum, as sufficient ground for admitting delegations from our formations to the signing of the Union treaty.

"Second—to create a USSR Supreme Soviet commission with powers to examine and resolve questions envisaged by the aforementioned legislative acts. [Signed] Marakutsa on behalf of the Dnestr Moldova SSR; Kendigelyan for the Gagauz Republic; Shamba for the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic; Chekhoyev for the South Ossetia Autonomous Oblast; Kogan for the Estonian SSR Interregional Council; and Bilans for the Lithuanian SSR's Shalchininkskiy Rayon."

The USSR Supreme Soviet's involvement in discussing the draft Union treaty does, indisputably, make sense, Deputy L. Arutyunyan thinks. It makes sense not only because a legitimate successor of the Union is essential and the Supreme Soviet could act as the spokesman for this successor's interests, but also because it is our lot to defend human rights and the rights of national minorities. Rights that republics will not defend. That is why I would like the draft Union Treaty to be examined with the object of verifying how far this document can defend the rights of national minorities and what kind of mechanism it contains for defending these rights. How far does it accord with international law in this sphere?

Chairman A. Lukyanov replied that all manner of examinations have been conducted.

Uzbekistan was one of the first to voice its opinion regarding the need to retain the Union, Deputy I. Saydakhmedov said, demonstrating this in the referendum, and it is ready to sign the proposed draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States. We can all see that the spread of the process of perestroyka in the country logically and inevitably brought about an increase in national self-awareness among all peoples and generated steadfast determination to do away with a unitary state based on the morally and politically obsolete administrative edict management system. The declaration of the republics' state sovereignty and legislative acts enshrining economic independence expressed the desire for economic and political sovereignty. Uzbekistan has also adopted such a declaration.

Plenty has been said from this rostrum about a crisis within society. There have been demands for the culprits to be named and the extent of their liability determined. But perhaps we should ask ourselves this question: How far are we liable? How far are the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet and members of parliament liable? Have we done everything we can for stabilization? Are we always right in the "war of laws?" Take the present situation. Before the draft of the new Union Treaty was published some mass media began an indiscriminate—any other word is simply inappropriate—campaign against this document. Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Nazarbayev, and other leaders of the republics on whose "nine plus one" statement the draft was based have been subjected to attacks in excess of every conceivable ethical norm. What have we not heard! Regrettably, we have already somehow gotten accustomed to this kind of talk, but it must be ignored today.

Let us remember 1990, the year when the overwhelming majority of Union and autonomous republics adopted declarations of sovereignty. Thus, the RSFSR adopted a document of this kind 12 June, the Ukraine followed suit 16 June, Belorussia 27 June, Kazakhstan 25 October, and the second session of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet adopted a declaration of sovereignty 20 June 1990.

So, the steps taken during the perestroyka years by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and other republics' supreme soviets to strengthen their sovereignty, along with the new Union treaty, do not represent the road to uncertainty, but a struggle for the rights lost during the years when the administrative edict system held sway, a return to Lenin's idea of a Union of sovereign states.

In conclusion I. Saydakhmedov made remarks and suggestions regarding the text of individual points and articles of the treaty and urged everyone else to sign this treaty.

N. Grishchenko spoke on behalf of the USSR trade unions.

What is the main conclusion that can be drawn right now, the deputy said, if one is being realistic? The main conclusion is this: The treaty must be signed without delay. Life does not stand still.

What is the main aim that the founders of the Union are setting themselves? I shall quote from the preamble: "To create conditions for the all-around development of each individual and the reliable guarantee of individual rights and freedoms." But what are those rights? They are the constitutional right to work, leisure, health protection, material security in old age, in the event of illness, or loss of the ability to work, the right to housing and to education. Without dwelling on all those I will say that in the absence of a treaty these words are being violated and will continue to be violated even more.

Take the right to work. Recently in this building, in this place, we heard about progress in the fulfillment of the Fundamentals of Legislation on the Employment of the Population which came into force 1 July. Here are some figures. This year 12 million people will seek work. Of those 6 million will find work themselves, that is, jobs are ready for them. Some 3 million will become employable only after retraining. Another 1.5 million will be offered part-paid social work, that is, work that is paid but not very much. Some 1.5 million may become unemployed, that is, their situation is deteriorating. Can this be avoided? Yes. Not in isolation, however, but by pursuing coordinated, unionwide and republican employment programs, coordinating migration processes, introducing a contract system and so forth. But by mid-June only five republics—the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan—had adopted laws on employment. In fact an employment fund has not been set up and other questions connected with the state employment service, cadre retraining, and so forth have not been resolved. Thus the treaty is needed and agreements on this score are needed, too.

It is the same with the right to social security. In nine republics belonging to the pension fund expenditure exceeds insurance contributions by over 2 billion rubles [R] a year. That is without taking into account compensation payments, which in turn require R8 billion. Thus it is necessary to come to the negotiating table sooner and agree on these guarantees, which we ourselves declared and continue to declare in this treaty—guarantees to citizens.

I propose that the draft union treaty be approved and ask all republics and the Union delegation to speed up its finalization and signing and ensure its earliest possible implementation. Second—that the proposed USSR Supreme Soviet draft resolution on this question be adopted and the Union delegation instructed to reflect our proposals in the negotiation process.

It seems to me, Deputy I. Andreyeva stated, that the version of the Union treaty which we are discussing today sets itself and, to a considerable extent, expresses the desire of the republics to move away from the unitary state system. The guarantee of that, which is stressed in the treaty a number of times, is the sovereignty of the republics. The treaty provides a foundation for progress toward fundamental, perpetual guarantees against possible manifestations even of tendencies to totalitarianism. This requires the Union as a guarantor, as a subject guaranteeing democracy and invested with powers from the republics themselves voluntarily, powers to prevent all manifestations of a totalitarian tendency.

But, naturally, I have some comments to make. I would like to draw attention to the following. This text retains vestiges of a treaty not between republics but between republics and the center and it seems to me that from this viewpoint the text of this treaty needs some really major editorial amendment.

On behalf of my voters, M. Pashaly stated, I would like to express an opinion at the Supreme Soviet today—that the conclusion of the treaty be speeded up. Our peoples need the treaty because vitally important questions are not being resolved. I have closely studied the proposals of the committees and commissions and I want now to express support for those proposals. Of course, the draft treaty needs further work. I would ask, as an Armenian deputy has suggested here, that a special place in the draft treaty be assigned to the small nations.

Unfortunately in the Republic of Moldova the leadership has still not decided to sign the treaty. We very much hope that healthy forces will prevail.

But if it turns out that the treaty is not signed there is the Law on the demarcation of the functions of the Soviet Union and the republics, which we adopted two years ago, which allocates a special place to areas with a high population density of a given people. Their opinion must be taken into account and they must be allowed to sign the union treaty.

I think, deputy Yu. Sokolova said, that we are talking about a very personal treaty, although we call it the Union treaty. No, it is the personal destiny of each of us at stake.

When families get together in the evening they talk about how hard life is not only because it is difficult in a material sense but because there is much that is vague, uncertain, insecure, and unstable. We need faith in the future and I am sure that the Union treaty can restore that faith to us. Yes, I think that this must be a treaty of people of honor who give their word and stick to it. But without wanting to occupy your attention with what has already been said here, this is why we, and especially the "Zhizn" group and our Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, of which I have the honor to be secretary, examined the treaty first of all from the viewpoint of the priority of human rights. There is a hope that other documents and the Constitution, of which the union treaty forms the basis, will expand those norms and strengthen them, will give people confidence that what has already been won, those norms which ensured people the right to work, education, and health protection, that they will be backed up and developed.

I hope that the USSR Supreme Soviet will make a further contribution to the elaboration of the new constitution.

I would like to make a few proposals, deputy Yu. Sharipov stated. First. It is expedient to elaborate a mechanism for the participation in the delegations of republics signatories to the Union treaty of representatives of ethnic groups which do not have autonomous ethnic units, as well as the ethnic minorities living in close-knit communities among indigenous peoples.

Second, the durability and stability of each state and the Union are underpinned by interest. First and foremost economic interest. The voluntary integration of all its participants. That is ensured via the market. If the Union Treaty is assessed from that standpoint it may be said that many of its articles are aimed at ensuring the mutually beneficial economic collaboration of the republics with the center playing a coordinating role.

Third—one of the most complex and contentious issues—the demarcation of functions between the Union and the republics. A provision of Articles 5 and 6 reflects a compromise between the republics and the center. I think that, in order to preserve the federal structure of the Union and safeguard the functioning of the unionwide market, it would be expedient to place under the Union's jurisdiction, as many people have now proposed, the implementation of a single credit monetary taxation and price policy based on a common currency, a convertible currency furthermore. The customs service should also be under Union jurisdiction, which will make it possible to ensure the unity of the economic space throughout the country's territory. In the draft treaty these questions are placed under joint jurisdiction.

Fourth—the question of the division of property between the union and the republics must not be an end in itself. It must be resolved naturally, proceeding in tandem with the implementation of denationalization and privatization.

Fifth. Disputes are continuing about taxes and the procedure for forming the Union budget. The preservation of a single federal tax is very important from the viewpoint of uniform demands on all enterprises within the framework of the unionwide market and a stable source of Union budget revenue. The list and scales of these taxes should be agreed with the republics and then enshrined in Union legislation.

Sixth. The treaty determines only the basic principles of economic relations in the renewed Union, thus there is an urgent need, esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet, to develop it and give it concrete form by an agreement on the economic union.

Deputy U. Orozova sided with those deputies who advocated the earliest possible signing of the treaty. At the same time she voiced a few comments.

Someone who does not own property and finance, U. Orozova said, is dependent. Even we, people's deputies, are today dependent on the state in the economic sense. Often this also leads to political dependence. I do not think we will allow our fragile state, our new Union, to fall to its knees and go with outstretched hand to beg for the financial support for this Union.

She called for a working group to be set up as soon as possible to summarize the comments which have been made. She insisted that these comments and the new draft treaty be presented to the Fifth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

V. Tetenov, chairman of the Committee for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions, spoke on the committee's behalf. He noted with satisfaction that the draft assigns a major role to transport as well as communications and information science systems. Of course the existing transport and communications management structure must be modernized and enriched with horizontal ties and new relations between the central leadership and enterprises, the main aim of which is to ensure their development and give people an incentive to work.

Deputies devoted the last hour to questions which had been deferred. It was decided to discuss the proposal of a group of worker deputies on amendments to one article of the Law on Privatization at the sixth session.

Then the Union parliamentarians adopted a resolution on violations of article 45 of the USSR Constitution on citizens' right to education. The reason for this was that at a number of higher and secondary specialized educational establishments recently the administration of those institutions has, in one form or another, breached the USSR Constitution and Soviet people's constitutional rights by demanding guarantees of the payment of tuition when accepting secondary school graduates.

There was quite a stormy debate over another resolution—on the work of the Commission on Privileges and Benefits in the implementation of its proposals—which proved fruitless. For the umpteenth time the absence of a quorum was recorded at the end of the evening sitting.

Political & Social

Shevardnadze Views G-7, Yugoslavia, Press

OW1807033491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 17 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] THE G-7 MEETING AND SOVIET ECONOMIC PROGRAMS: In principle, Yavlinsky is right. I met him at Harvard University when he was working on his program. The program was certainly a sensible and rational one.

I met with President Bush, President Mitterand and Chancellor Kohl. I spoke out in favor of inviting our president to the London meeting. The very fact of his presence there is a major event. But we should not deceive ourselves that Mikhail Gorbachev will return from London with millions in hard currency in his pockets. Even if he choses a program which meets all the conditions set by our partners, this will not take place. It is realistic to think that we can find tens of billions of rubles in investments in the Soviet economy.

But if there will be a conceptual discussion, if we are able to convince out partners of our readiness for coopration, this will be a huge step forward.

Unfortunately, today we have "Pavlov's crisis program". But I would have liked to think that the president was going to London to present an anti-crisis program.

I am not blaming anybody, I am also involved—after all, I joined the Politburo—but we should have passed a law on foreign investments four of five years ago. If we had dealt with this then, we would certainly have been able to avoid many of the problems with which we are now faced.

YUGOSLAVIAN SITUATION: There is a certain contradiction in the approach of individual countries and state leaders. On the one hand, they support the right of nations to self-determination (in particular as far as the Baltic republics of the Soviet Union are concerned), on the other hand they are against the independence of Slovenia and Croatia.

I think that everything that is happening in Yugoslavia is an completely internal matter. The least categorical statement on how people should live, the better.

In this context the UN should play an important role. It should help to find a common language between the leadership of the country and the republics.

GERMAN UNIFICATION: We knew that difficulties were unavoidable during unification and immediately afterwards. Two different systems, two societies with different ways of living were united. But let us view the question in a different light: How could we oppose unity if the people were on the streets? The demonstration were peaceful, but they could easily have turned violent.

A decision which met the interests of the German people, Europe and the whole world, had to be taken in a very short period of time—six or seven months. There was no third path—unification or war.

All treatise which were signed and ratified by the parliament after long and detailed debate create normal conditions for the unification of this nation. I do not reject the claim that they not be completely full or perfect, but on the whole the treaties met general interests.

THE WORK OF THE SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY: This is an unique apparatus with unique people. It is indeed a highly intellectual collective. Everything we have achieved in the last few years, and we can rightly talk of an historic achievement, has been won by the collective of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR.

If the country will succeed in coming out of the crisis, if it can solve its internal problems, I am certain that the foreign policy will not let the country down.

PRESS ATTACKS: Here there are many factors which led to the campaign against me. I consider it to be beneath me even to react to such a thing.

I am in favor of dialogue, on any from of hard-hitting discussion—but always with respect and reserve. That is the only road to truth.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on New Reform Movement

AU1707121291 Warsaw TRYBUNA in Polish 15 Jul 91 p 2

[Interview with former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Olga Trofimova; place and date not given: "That Is My Main Mission and Challenge"]

[Text] [Trofimova] A new "star" has appeared on the USSR's sociopolitical firmament, the "Unification of Democratic Forces and Reform" Movement. Yet it is already being criticized from all sides. For example, some Communists are surprised about the talk of a "new step in democratic development" contained in the movement's declaration. They claim that a lot of this declaration corresponds to the CPSU draft program. One hears left-wing democrats complaining that no concrete program promising rapid results has been formulated. As one of the initiators of this movement, what do you have to say on this subject?

[Shevardnadze] Our movement is still in its formative stage, and only naive people can criticize it for not having a concrete program. The general objectives and paths have been described in the adopted "unification of democratic forces and reform" declaration. As for concrete tactical and strategic tasks, these are yet to be worked out, and by democratic means.

In September we wish to convene a founding congress to unite the democratic movements and parties in the republics and regions. The congress will also determine the movement's organizational shape, for example whether or not it will be a party; adopt a program and statute; and work out concrete ways of extricating Soviet society from the crisis, accelerating the economic reforms, building a rule-of-law state, and preventing a further deterioration of the social situation. By the way, we are devoting much thought to the problem of how to deal with unemployment, which genuinely exists today, and with the social security of citizens.

It is also necessary to establish how to transform the economic system, encourage enterprise,and proceed to a market economy.

We will also coordinate our stances concerning cooperation between nationalities. We attach priority to relations between the republics and the development of so-called horizontal links. Relations between the center and the republics should also be governed by their own system. To our mind, the spiritual, economic, and political liberty of the individual is the basis of the whole state. We must decide what to do to make the Soviet citizen more free and make him the real manager of his assets and fruits of his work.

We must also create the conditions for equal cooperation with foreign countries concerning foreign policy matters and economic contacts, a cooperation based on mutual interest. Foreign investments are one example. I do not mean gifts from foreign countries, but mutually advantageous cooperation. It is also possible to amend some foreign policy guidelines. The founding congress will occupy itself with all this.

[Trofimova] Some Western observers are trying to detect some hidden purpose behind the movement. Is there one?

[Shevardnadze] Our movement is not at all a confrontational one. Immediately after their formation, some parties and political movements sometimes declare their hostility toward other political and state structures, but we hold a constructive stance. We are loyal to the government and president and will support them in their pursuit of "politics" for the people. However, if they make mistakes, we will act as an opposition force. Of course, we will also try and steer public opinion in the direction we consider to be correct.

We are banking on young people in particular. We know that the young people in our country are watching our movement very carefully and that they want to understand and feel what kind of force this is. We have already established contacts with many of their leaders. In fact, our movement is for young people, for the sake of future generations. Therefore, we would like our compatriots to convince themselves that we initiators of this movement are concerned first of all about them, their children, and their grandchildren.

[Trofimova] Because you have quit the ranks of the CPSU, people think that your example will be followed and there will be a mass exodus of Communists and, in a certain sense, a collapse of the Communist Party. What do you think?

[Shevardnadze] I said in Leningrad that I do not intend to gain anything out of anticommunism, and I would like to make that clear. If some Communists want to quit the party, they are acting in accordance with their conscience. One should not dramatize the situation and seek guilty people. If the CPSU collapses, that is the party's business.

I can only add that it is thanks to the activity of the party apparatus itself that the danger of a collapse of the CPSU has become real. I see that party officials and other ultraconservative activists have been directing a flood of slander, and even lies, at our movement and its leaders recently. That proves that we are acting correctly. My reaction to this is a calm one, though personally I cannot avoid feeling hurt. However, I do not intend to respond in the same tone. I can quarrel with the conservatives, but in a proper tone.

[Trofimova] When you quit the post of USSR foreign minister and became leader of the Independent Foreign Policy Association, you proceeded to a new quality of activity, so to speak. Now you are stuck in a whirlwind of emotions and political woes. So have you returned to great politics? If so, why?

[Shevardnadze] I repeat, the main thing guiding me and other supporters of the movement is a concern for future generations. I am convinced that the older generation, including me, should exercise responsibility and introduce young people to the political stage today. Our often bitter life's experience should be useful on the new road.

I personally do not aspire to be a member of the state hierarchy. My supreme purpose and challenge is to create normal conditions for the life and work of young people. I want to do something useful while I still can.

Well-Known Figures Join Democratic Movement

PM1707114291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by unnamed IZVESTIYA correspondent from news agencies roundup: "In Support of the New Movement"]

[Text] An IZVESTIYA correspondent has learned that a whole string of people who are well known in the country have declared their adherence to the Movement for Democratic Reforms. They include E. Sagalayev, chairman of the USSR Journalists Union Council; M. Minasbekyan, chairman of the coordinating council of the "Soglasiye" ["Accord"] group of people's deputies; M. Shatrov, the dramatist; S. Khadzhiyev, USSR minister of chemical and petroleum processing industry; P. Bunich, president of the USSR Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs; other personalities in science and culture; a large group of leaders of oblasts and regions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]; and a number of big economic managers.

We were told that the Movement has already received substantial mail—more than 3,000 letters and telegrams. They contain messages and resolutions from individual citizens and entire collectives. An analysis of the correspondence shows that some 10 percent of the authors object to the very formation of the Movement for Democratic Reforms. The others declare their active support for it.

Popov on Conditional Support for Gorbachev

OW1707125491 Tokyo KYODO in English 1202 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Tokyo, July 17 KYODO—Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov said Wednesday that a newly established centrist political force will support President Mikhail Gorbachev as a candidate in the presidential election scheduled for next year if he agrees on a platform to be introduced by the force in this September.

Popov made the remark at a press conference at the Japan National Press Club in reference to the July 1 establishment of the democratic reform movement by leading Soviet liberals.

Among the liberals, including several close to Gorbachev, are former Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Gorbachev's close aid Aleksandr Yakovlev.

Popov, a radical reformist, said the new movement is not a political base for Gorbachev and that it is not interested in what the president thinks.

The scholar-turned-politician, however, said the centrist political force will back Gorbachev as a presidential candidate if he agrees on their future platform.

The movement is aimed at creating a popular democratic party, said Popov, adding that the party will not be characterized as a social democracy.

The party will group employers and the entrepreneurs of military- industrial complex in addition to civic people and liberals, Popov said.

The Democratic Reform Movement will hold its founding congress in mid-September to decide ways of pursuing a Soviet democratic society.

He said a reform program conceived by former Russian Deputy Premier Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and economists from Harvard University is aimed at achieving a swift move toward a market-oriented economy in the Soviet Union.

Popov said the Yavlinskiy program is not an economic but an ideological plan acceptable to Western industrial countries.

The mayor said the most important economic task of the Soviet Union is to create private farmers, who will provide food for the Soviet people.

Popov said the strengthening of private farmers is a way of regenerating the Soviet economy.

Ivashko Gives Telephone Interview

LD1707090991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1842 GMT on 16 July carries a 75-minute live studio phone-in, during its scheduled "Direct Conversation" program, with

Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and presented by Vitaliy Vladimirovich Vishnevskiy.

Vishnevskiy begins by inviting viewers to take part in the program. He goes on to say that, while preparing this program, he met Ivashko earlier and was impressed by his personality. To present Ivashko to the viewers, Vishnevskiy would like first to ask him some questions outside politics, for example, what Ivashko likes and dislikes in people. Ivashko names decency and ability to work hard as major assets and falsity as something he abhors. Asked by Vishnevskiy about his own shortcomings Ivashko generalizes about the fallibility of men—nobody is an angel—but refuses to be more specific. Then Vishnevskiy asks Ivashko to speak about his most memorable moments of triumph and weakness.

By way of answering the question, Ivashko says that "there is no point in giving up, it is simply essential to go forward." Yes, there were various turning points in his life, but he always endeavored to remain himself and to retain his self-respect. He agrees he always led from the front, but his style was not to attack, as the interviewer puts it. Too many words of this kind are currently bandied about, but "you know, the current state of society—it is a most profound conviction of mine—is such that it needs reason and calm. It is, of course, a thousandfold easier said than done, but, nonetheless, it is here, rather than in attacks, that there is a way out of the situation in which our whole country and our whole people find themselves. Let us have no attacks."

Vishnevskiy asks what is the reason for the CPSU's crisis. Ivashko says that the party's previous epithets—invincible, at the helm—were just slogans, whereas "the real situation of the party was not as it used to be generally portrayed and this was the case earlier on, too. It is society that is undergoing a crisis and it is, evidently, this that must be a starting point. As for the party, it is a part of society. Naturally these crisis aspects manifest themselves in it, too and it could not simply be otherwise." People joined the party for various reasons. "All the crisis phenomena that exist in society, exist in the party. Their extent may vary, but they do exist. Evidently it is not now worth it to have recourse to the stereotypes which were formulated in the past; it is worth it to have recourse to the realities and to proceed from them."

Replying to the interviewer's question about what his attitude to the word "crisis" is, Ivashko says that it is a reality. "The crisis does exist. It manifests itself in many things. After all, events took place in the life of the party which altered its internal state radically. For many years, our party was not so much a leading one, as a managing one. It is, therefore, natural that many people have become accustomed to fulfilling the managerial functions. This function has now disappeared from the party. It is necessary to find a new place in the political life, and I am deeply convinced that it is only this place that may determine its vital activities, its work for the good of the people, because, all the same, the interests of the people take precedence over the interests of any other force in society or any party. So, it is necessary to find this place. It is not so complicated to find it from the point of view of ideology in general. No one needs a party which has no policy of its own, especially a socioeconomic policy. This policy has been voiced by us, say at the CPSU's 28th Congress, in the decisions of the subsequent plenary sessions of the party's Central Committee, and in other party documents—but it is now necessary to implement it. Earlier one could have it implemented via simple commands, but now a place has to be found in a labor collective, in the oblast, in the region, in the republic and it is very complicated. There is, however, no need to accuse anyone. It is necessary simply to work here, to find this place. Well, it is this watershed, this transition that determines the main thing in the party's crisis. And, apart from that, there is, after all, a powerful anti-communist propaganda, there is an overexcited, that is how I would put it, social awareness, there exist the realities of life which surround every person today, the realities which are, unfortunately, very sad. All this does leave its mark and here courage, confidence, and reason alike are needed to get out of this situation."

Vishnevskiy adds that some people joined the party hoping to promote their careers and now are confused and frightened. Ivashko agrees that confusion is disturbing "but, you see, I would not exaggerate the number of those who joined the party deliberately for career purposes. The system itself simply fed that idea to people that, as a party member, one had greater prospects in work, I would say. But I would like to stress the following simple thing. Workers used to join the party without any career ambitions. Some joined it following their desire, others influenced by agitation, when people were persuaded to join in order to preserve a certain percentage of workers within the party. But I would like to stress the main thought, that the best workers used to join the party. Of course, not all the best workers—I would not like to give such an idea—but nevertheless, the best ones. No idlers, shirkers, or drunks used to join the party since nobody invited or admitted them to the party. Therefore, it is fundamentally wrong, in my view, to think that people used to join the party driven by nothing but career ambitions, it would mean to hurt the party and those people".

Vishnevskiy takes over to say that he believes that such careerists present a greater danger than those who joined the party in true faith. Ivashko adds: "I think that, on the whole, such people have already left the party, those who see nothing but a bright future tailored to their desires. You know there was the following banner at a rally, I do not remember the whole of it but the last lines were: 1978—if you wish to have a career, join the party; 1990—if you wish to have a career, leave the party. So I think that this part has already left, it is now specializing, to a great degree, in somehow showing its non-party loyalty..."

Vishnevskiy interrupts: "Not to stand aloof but to contribute one's might to criticism."

Ivashko continues: "Yes, yes, this is going on, this is a kind of disease. But I would like to come back to the subject of confusion. This is, perhaps, significantly more important than what we are discussing. After all, very many people are confused. The individual simply does not know how to find his place, what his future will be, will there be light at the end of the tunnel if he stays in the party ranks, what is it for, who it serves, why it is so bad around us now—these and many other questions do cause confusion. Is there a medicine against this mood? There is, no doubt. The medicine consists in the need for an individual, an organization, a cell to find a concrete application for their efforts. Only here do I see a way out of the situation."

Vishnevskiy says that, perhaps, some degree of clarity will be brought when the new draft program of the party is published. Ivashkoreplies: "Regarding the draft. Yesterday the working group sent this document for examination—it is already the eighth version drawn up by the working group—to members of the program commission, members of the CPSU Central Committee, and other comrades who will take part in the plenum which, as is known, will be held on 25 July and, perhaps, 26 July—well, it depends on the way matters develop, anyway, it will start on 25 July—in order to check whether it is acceptable as a draft and to publish it in the press to discuss and examine these issues.

"I cannot now say that it is a draft. This is because the full program commission has not yet seen it. It is after the 28th, following the sitting of the program commission, that changes were introduced there. I would say they were very cardinal changes, very thoroughly elaborated. It has now been made into a document that is not bulky and it defines things that are surely the main things for any political party: these are the principles upon which it intends to construct its activities and its goals. It has been defined whom it intends to serve, what its history and its lessons are and, finally, the party's place as a real political force. Here, then, is the range of questions the document confines itself to. I do not know what will remain of it following the sitting of the program commission and following the CPSU Central Committee plenum, but that is the way it looks today. The guiding slogan is: Socialism, democracy, progress. Here are three words that embody the main elements of this program. The document itself is reformist, I would say. It is directed at renewing the party from within. It is, perhaps, in this that we see the main aspect of the further dynamics, the development of the party. At the same time, there is continuity there. There is a continuity, the adherence to the socialist ideal which, in our profound conviction, is immortal. Under various names this idea has lived through millenia and it will continue to live on."

Asked what he means by "various names", Ivashko says that in one form or another it has existed since the early Christians and mentions various types of socialism that have existed ever since. "It is not a matter of terminology here, but of the essence: it is a matter of having a society where there is social justice."

Vishnevskiy asks how the grass-roots people can get involved in this whole process and Ivashko replies: "Through specific implementation of jointly elaborated policies." Representative organizations must exist—taking account of the views of the public they must then get down to implementing policies, through consensus and not diktat. Vishnevskiy says that people we used to call the servants of the people only served their own interests. He is worried lest there should be a recurrence of this and admits to having only a hazy notion of how the grassroots can become involved in tackling the cardinal problems that exist.

Ivashko replies: "Well, in this respect I am a servant of the people. Many people were indeed serving their own interests, but many people served the people. And people are not all the same today and any generalization in this sense, you know, is unsatisfactory because in our own history we can recall the most outstanding individuals wo are remembered in a way that one can only envy and we also know those who became famous for their love of self."

Ivashko adds: "As far as this link is concerned, it has, all the same, to be defined in a sensible correlation between the activity of the cell and of the person or the people who are authorized by this cell to determine and to work out each particular issue of problem, each particular objective or task. And in the final analysis in this way it is possible to determine with this representative approach the main thing that is needed in the particular situation. Never has there been anywhere the kind of policy that would be equal to everyone's liking, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, nor will there ever be."

Vishnevskiy asks if Ivashko thinks that the program is capable of satisfying all the trends that are now taking place in the part.

Ivashko says: "In no way. There is no person today nor group of people who would be capable of drawing up a program document of that kind, pleasing in an identical way to all the people who are in the ranks of the party today. The fact is that the party is divided into different strata. It includes people with the most diverse convictions and platforms, with different approaches, different points of view. Of itself this is nothing terrible. To a certain extent, even, it's a good thing because the party must be a living organism, it must not be a kind of order, it must not be a masonic lodge, it must not be a structure made of reinforced concrete. If the party lives, then it exists,then it is needed. If it has become ossified then the result is what has actually happened and what we see today in practice. This diversity of opinions, therefore, is not of itself a dreadful thing. Naturally one has to find the kind of option here regarding any decision—including that on the program document—that would be

100 percent to the liking of a certain group of people; that would be 90 percent to the liking of some other people to the left and right of them; that would be 80 percent to the liking for some more. Here the art of the discussion of the draft program—the art, let me stress that word—is going to consist in finding well-known compromises and some people are going to have to forgo their positions to the extent of this 20 percent. If these differences are cardinal ones, then each person is going to have to determine his destiny around the program—not around the draft, I think: a draft is a draft, after all, there'll be an all-union conference or congress of the party and that will take place soon, obviously this is a question of months—and after it is adopted then will come the moment of truth when people are going to have to make up their minds, either in this party, or in another one, or in no party at all."

Vishnevskiy expresses concern that competition between people who have different ideas can be replaced by the contest of ambitions. Ivashko replies by referring to the abundance of talented people in all walks of life. Some people talk a lot, setting out their ideas in a strident manner and many people occupy their time more with talking and writing and less with reading. Vishnevskiy refers to people who have left the party not because of their principles, but to gain popularity. He is concerned that people might reject the draft again not because of their principles, but, rather, to make everyone notice their gesture. Ivashko replies: "There is no need to overestimate the numbers of these people. We have taken a very close look: out of those who left the party last year, only between three and four percent left to join some other movements, or parties, or something else. The overwhelming majority are simply nowhere today. These people need to think and to make up their minds. There are those who think about returning to the fold—and there are quite a few of them. Let them think. At the end of the day this is a process of re-evaluation which surely every person ought to undergo. Every person ought to make up his mind himself. Nor is there any need to demand of a person that he do this quickly. "Vishnevskiy agrees with this, but says that the time has also come to get on with things. Ivashko replies that spontaneously leaving the party and then spontaneously returning to the fold quickly is something individuals might do, but, in general, people ought to make up their minds about their place in society.

Vishnevskiy then asks Ivashko: if he is "firmly convinced, personally. Ivashko replies: "But a return to a dictatorship, or to the establishment, as it were, of some kind of dictatorship, is not a return to the past. This could happen, this aspect, in the course of the development of the social process, although it is completely without any future. And I would like to ask you—and now I am addressing the TV viewers, too—let us bandy words about as little as possible. You know, words like dictatorship and civil war now can be now be heard or seen in print in our country on a daily basis. These are terrible (?things). One needs to stop and think this over. Is it at all conceivable to imagine for oneself what a dictatorship is like? After all, a dictatorship... a dictatorship exists so that concentration camps and executions can exist, for, otherwise, what sort of dictatorship is this? A civil war in a society that is oversaturated with weapons, moreover, with weapons of mass destruction—is this conceivable? There is no need to bandy these words about. After all, the future does not lie in this. The future lies in consensus and in constructive work—in this, indeed, there is no other future."

Vishnevskiy says that he often thinks that people frighten themselves. Ivashko says: "the main thing is not to overstep the mark, because sometimes words, incautious words, are followed by such things for which neither the people, nor the future, nor history will forgive anyone."

Vishnevskiy says that questions are now ready. He reads out the first: "All republics have communist parties. What, then, is the CPSU? Is it Gorbachev, Ivashko, and others?" Ivashko replies: "No, it is not Gorbachev, Ivashko, and others, although it is also Gorbachev, Ivashko, and others. We have the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This communist party consists of millions of people who also live in various republics. Everyone, in the state structures and, in general, in our whole, great, multinational people and in the party alike, should take account of the specific features of people's lives in this or that republic. And the natural process that is taking place in society—the growth of national self-awareness—cannot bypass the party either. However, the republican communist parties have, after all, agreed that they would act proceeding from a common ideoplogical-organizational platform and this is the main thing and it is this that is the CPSU."

Vishnevskiy reads a question from vyacheslavovich, from Leningrad, about Comrade Ivashko's attitude toward the democratic reform movement and toward the activities of the movement.

Ivashko replies: "Well, as for the activities, there is nothing I can say about this, because I have not, as yet, seen the activities. As for my attitude toward the democratic reform movement, this is what I can reply: I have no intention of joining this movement, although if you take the published statements, at least, then the ideas laid down in our party's documents, including the 28th Congress' program statement are, after all, to be found there—well, I do not know to what extent in percentage terms, I have not calculated this, but may be 90 percent." When pressed by Vishnevskiy to say precisely why he has no intention of joining the democratic reform movement, Ivashko says: "I am explaining why—I mean one cannot come out against this document, because it would be coming out against something I share, something that has been recorded in the 28th Party Congress' decisions. How can I come out against this? But, at the same time, I see no need to join it. I have not lost my belief in, and hope for the fact that the renewal of the party, its progress along the path of democratization, along the path of serving the interests of the state is possible. Therefore, why should I join anything if I can act within the framework and within the confines of this party?"

Replying a question whether two parties can exist in the Soviet Union, Ivashko says that you can read such things everywhere now and that comparisons are being made with the two party systems in the United States, or the UK—but it must be understood that it had taken decades and even centuries for such a system to be established. Nowhere has it been the case that a system like that would come into being overnight.

Vishnevskiy observes that the Soviet Union does not have the necessary standards for the existence of two different trends. Ivashko adds: "We have no democratic experience. That is the main thing. As a result we have no political standards. In this kind of situation, where people who have had an identical upbringing—with certain nuances and differences over the fine points—suddenly begin to go their separate ways, then simply dividing them into left and right will never work because the stratification in the party and in society is much more complex than can be gathered on the basis of the speculative scheme you have just expressed."

Vishnevskiy asks if Ivashko believes that the published program will lead to further discussion and serious discussion? Ivashko says: "Absolutely." He adds: "When the draft program is published, no matter what kind of program it is—and this I stress—and no matter who has made it, it will nevertheless give rise to some very stormy discussion. For some people it will appear to be too radical. For others it will appear to be too conservative. That is bound to happen. That will happen because such is the stratification in real terms. But the whole burden of this discussion must be to find the most accurate approaches, I would say, which will satisfy the greatest possible number of people who are able to group themselves around the pivot, around the party's new program."

Lyubomir Yuriyevich Yatskivskiy from Kiev asks whose interests does the CPSU defend currently and why aren't former members of the CPSU who have turned out to be two-faced being brought to account? Ivashko responds: "With regard to bringing to account people who have turned out to be two-faced. What kind of bringing to account are we talking about? If they have left the party—should we thereafter censure them or something more than that?"

(?Dzhusev), from Moscow asks for an explanation of who is to blame for the fact that the primary party organizations are not receiving recommendations about their work from party raykoms and gorkoms? Party meetings are not being held in many establishments. The functions of the secreteries of party organizations are being reduced to collection of membership subscriptions. Ivashko says: "I can forecast fairly accurately that at the next Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee a question will raised concerning changes to the Party Rules. Why do I say so? Because there is such a vast amount of mail on this topic. I do not want to say a single bad word against the Party Rules confirmed at the 28th Congress. After all, if you recall the debate before the Congress and at the Congress itself, the demands for maximum democratization, maximum independence, all this was reflected in the rules that we have now. Perhaps these rules were a little ahead of the real state of the party. They were a little ahead of themselves. They did not take into account that there exist traditions. There exists a certain inertia—not in a bad sense, I would say, but in the best sense of the word. For that reason, many vertical links have become confused in the new rules, the ones in operation presently. That is on the one hand. And on the other hand, evidently, in the course of many years the primary party organizations have been cursing the party raykoms, the obkoms, and so on for incessantly forcing the agenda of their meetings on them. Now they have given up imposing it, they seem to have made a compromise. But why not hold the party meetings? They say they don't know what has to be done. I have heard that a lot, when meeting people." Ivashko continues: "At the moment, I would say, the matter concerns the expansion of the market economy sphere, denationalization. And denationalization will take many years, and in general, far from everything will be denationalized, but people can think about it, the party organizations can meet and discuss the future of their own collective, their own enterprise, whether to take a lease out on it, or buy it out, or become a joint stock company. Who is to do it? After all, it is not a simple affair. You know, at Kamaz—by the way, they wrote in PRAVDA today that the workers of Kamaz are buying and getting shares in their enterprise, some people getting privileges, if they have worked at the enterprise a long time, some people getting them for a certain payment, others on credit, and so on. But it should be borne in mind that Kamaz has been preparing for three years to reach this point. After all, on the whole, it is incompetent to carry out instant denationalization, with the wave of a wand, privatization with a wave of a wand. We have had this kind of instant measure before and it brought the people nothing but misfortune. This is a process. Why should party organizations not mobilize forces, find some specialists, pay visits to discuss and gather together. Surely this has a specific place in the implementation of party policy in this matter. I think it is."

Vishnevskiy reads out a question about primary party organisations and another regarding Ivashko's salary. The latter explains: "My salary is the one established many years ago for members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. It is 1,200 rubles. It is a high salary. However, today, if one looks at it—of course, I do not compare myself with employees of joint ventures or with other people who have already entered the market economy, for that would be ridiculous on my part—I compare it with, well, for example, the secretary of a committee or commission in the Supreme Soviet now gets the same salary, and a deputy minister gets a far higher salary. It's all relative somehow".

Vishnevskiy then asks a diffuse question from a listener about a referendum on confidence in the CPSU. Ivashko finds this question difficult to understand but says: "I think that the CPSU is a political party. It was, essentially, the only political force at the Union referendum on the future of the Soviet Union. If you remember March, you will find a great many other political forces which used all sorts of pretext to say that the Soviet Union has outlived its use, and so on. We came out firmly in favor of the Soviet Union. At the time the people voted with us. We felt the victors in this referendum. How else can confidence be shown? If people have no confidence in you then today there are a great many parties and movements. Some have confidence in one party, some have confidence in another".

Vishnevskiy asks a question from Kiev on how the party plans to exculpate itself for the repressions of the thirties.

Ivashko replies: "In 1934, at the 16th Party Congress, 1.8 million members of the party and 900,000 candidate members of the party were presented. In 1939, 1.5 million members of the CPSU were presented, and something like 800,000 candidate members of the CPSU. Think about the dynamics of these figures. Why, in five years, did the party not become bigger, but much smaller? After all, in that period people were joining the party." Ivashko continues: "There had been 1.8 million and then there were 1.5 million. Where had those 300,000 gone? After all, the dynamic is always going up, an increase in the number of party members. I'll tell you the answer: 700,000 communists had been shot, repressed, in 1938-39. From 1.2 million to 900,000; from 2.7 million, one-quarter of the party was shot. [figures as heard] So you must understand that the party was the first victim of the terror which was organized by the totalitarian regime on behalf of the party. That is the issue. Of course sorrow and regret about these terrible pages in the history of our state and our people are the feelings which predominate in us. That's what I would like to say about that, and we, or at least those who work in the party today, we are trying to do everything to our last breath, to see that these terrible pages of history are never ever repeated."

Vishnevskiy looks at the point of view of people who joined the party in all sincerity, citing the example of his own mother who is still devoted to the party because she was brought up on its ideals. Ivashko says: "It is a complex question. But at the same time I would simply like to stress that I and my comrades categorically reject Stalinism as a form of rule by means of terror. And so I do not share either these approaches, nor do I share any responsibility for this. I do not cover up those terrible pages of history that took place. They did take place, this is a reality, you can't get away from it."

Vishnevskiy raises the issue of moving away from blind worship of the teaching that was been proclaimed as the banner of Marxism- Leninism? Ivashko responds: "With regard to blind worship, here I would like to say the following things—at least, this is how I understand this business. Mankind is a living thing and it has developed and progressed and various teachings have come into being. I, for example, came to Marxism not because I was given a particular quotation in my first lecture, but it so happened in life that almost independently I attended a two year course with a certain clever man who led me to Marxism from the ancient Chinese via the ancient Greeks and via all the Utopians and so on. If that is the way in which you arrive at some teaching then it becomes understandable for you. At the same time there is something else that I understand well: that besides Marx and Engels there existed other people who wrote works of various kinds dealing with the problems of the future, with problems of social development. There were non-Marxist socialist conceptions and naturally one has to take into account the whole spectrum of achievements of civilization. That is how it is possible to arrive at something."

Vishnevskiy points out that party members pulled out quotations from the works, those that were convenient. Ivashko says: "Vitaliy Vladimirovich, yes, that is what we all did, you mustn't deny it. The main thing is that if you take the collected works of Marx and Engels and Lenin you can find a quotation, a quotation which in general is fitting for any event in life, so to speak. But surely quotations aren't the point. What one has to do is take the dialectics, the thinking of these people, the Leninist dialectics. We've just been talking about people leaving the party—we've just been talking about it—we've been saying that it's changing and so on. After the 11th Congress, you know, after the 10th Congress, 27 percent of Communists left the party. They did not agree with Lenin's New Economic Policy. It radically exploded their ideals and on this basis one can accuse Lenin of betraying certain ideals. No. Lenin simply saw the dialectics of development and he moved in accordance with these dialectics. And we have to learn this from him, rather than seeking out an illuminating quotation for each step that we take."

Vishnevskiy cites Abram Yakovlevich Kats, from Moscow, who asks how Ivashko assesses the conference held in Minsk by Nina Andreyeva. And how do you view the demand made by that conference that Gorbachev should be excluded from the party? Ivashko replies: "My attitude to that conference is as follows:"

"The attempts to have the old returned are unproductive. And I think that the line they took there is unproductive. As for expelling specific individuals from the party—well, this smacks strongly for me of the well-known times when one would be pleased that one was expelled from the party and that nothing worse happened to one, as it were. Well, what sort of attitude can I have to this? My attitude is negative."

Vishnevskiy asks if by criticizing the past so much, do people not thereby deflect criticism of themselves over the past six years of perestroyka, thus avoiding an examination of their own errors? Ivashko replies: "Well, I think that we are simply dealing with two different things here. In the first place, one must know history. In order to know it, it must first be written. Many people do not like to hear this, when I say this, but, after all, there is simply no person alive in our country who would know the CPSU's history or, let us say, the USSR's history after the October period. This is because there existed one so-called history, from which personalities and events were expurgated and a completely artificial scheme was created; it was the sole correct version."

Ivashko continues: "Subsequently, another history appeared. It appeared mainly in the press. As far as the method of its compilation is concerned, if you collate very many publications into one, single whole, it represented the selfsame, if you like, Brief Course, only written the other way around: not from the left to the right, but from the right to the left. History must yet be written and analyzed. Incidentally, people are now doing this work, it is a very complex undertaking, because there is an avalanche of information to be sifted through. One must come to feel these people—after all, they were erased from history. They must yet be found. This is, you know, an integral and a very important part of the matter—after all, people cannot live without history. How can it be otherwise? All this should be taking place normally. But, as for what is taking place now and what has been taking place for the past six years, I would not yet call it history. In any case, these events, phenomena, and processes must be analyzed in depth and, what is most important, lessons must be drawn from the errors that have already been allowed to occur; very serious errors in the course of these six years, especially in the economic sphere."

Vishnevskiy cites the anti-alcohol campaign and promised housing by the year 2000 as errors. Ivashko responds: "Appropriate lessons must be learned and drawn from this. And it is here that the state structures ought to follow the lessons with very great precision, otherwise things will look very bad. After all, society cannot live within the framework of populism as a marketable commodity. In the first years, sometime in 1986, 1987, 1988, well, I cannot call them other than populist, well, there were these trends when the wages would go up sharply, when the barrier between cash and clearing turnover was infringed, when money poured into circulation, when shops were emptied and there was, into the bargain, a curtailment of production—lessons must be drawn from this. It is not history at all—it is tangible, everyday work by the government and state bodies and in this sense our policy is, incidentally, against these extremes, just as it is against populism, too, because populism, especially when combined with nationalism and chauvinism, assumes fascist overtones, this is what history tells us. It is a big and serious topic.

Vishnevskiy asks how long the errors must be analyzed. Ivashko says: "Apparently all of us must do some work. Well, take a look at what we have done—moreover, it was not done by the central government".

Ivashko continues: "A huge number of production facilities producing medications have been closed. We are considering where to get them from. We draw cartoons in KROKODIL and other magazines and papers on the subject of the lack of medicines in pharmacies. There is no hard currency to buy them abroad, and we are closing our own works. Why are we closing them, or why have we closed a huge number of them? Because they are ecologically harmful. But after all, these enterprises are ecologically harmful everywhere in the world. Wouldn't it be simpler to concentrate all our efforts on putting in the relevant purification equipment, or, to put it briefly, all the protection for people living near these enterprises from these harmful emissions, but nevertheless to produce medicines?" Ivashko says that the Germans had the polluting Ruhr factories made ecologically pure. Everyone ought to draw this lesson.

Vishnevskiy asks whether the party's failure to analyze its errors during perestroyka is not grist to the mill of those who are against the party? Ivashko replies: "I think that the biggest incorrect steps have already been analyzed in, as it were, a very serious manner. It is another matter that it is easier to get into a trap than to get out of it. But this is already a practical matter, as it were. As for the errors that have been allowed to occur, it was, incidentally, none other than me, who in October last year, at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, in a report that was devoted to the issues of the development of the economy spoke of the fatal consequences of unjustified printing of money in our state, of the necessity of tying work results very harshly to incomes—I spoke of this, so these errors have been analyzed, but it is another matter that it is very complicated to put them right because, after all, well—it can be done and many people write: let us carry out a confiscating money reform."

"That is to say let's take away the money. But they will take it away equally from those who have earned it with their honest labor—and incidentally they will be the overwhelming majority—and from those who have acquired it dishonestly. True, these people are sufficiently experienced to be able to conceal it and for them the losses will be much smaller than for ordinary working people. Therefore the government has already promised not to do that. Is it really possible to give promises and then immediately break them? People must not be worried about this." Ivashko adds: "Bringing calm into society is task number one. There is a well-known sickness here, if you like, perhaps it doesn't have a medical name, but it is a destructive one, it acts upon the nerves and the cardiovascular system because the whole time the individual has no confidence in himself. And then there are the endless built-on disturbances, who in the party is leaving, who's joining together, what movement has been organized, who's done something else. This doesn't add a single pair of underclothes, not a single sack of potatoes, nothing else whatsoever. It's just boiling passions in the built-on superstructure."

Vishnevskiy reminds Ivashko that there are just two minutes left and asks him to give his forecast for the future. Ivashko replies: "You'd be better off not asking me for a forecast—we've got lots of soothsayers and astrologers and so on now and you'd be better off going to them. But as far as how all this is going to go is concerned it is going to be very sharp. I am sure of that. It couldn't be otherwise for the simple reason that the situation is a sharp one. It would be naive in an acute situation to try to get some kind of undisturbed pond, some kind of quiet water. The fact that no matter how sharp things are, reason, standards, and responsibility must triumph is another matter. This triad, if it stands at the head of all the actions of all the people, so to speak, it will ensure stabilization in society and its movement forward along the road of progress.

Vishnevskiy asks Ivashko if he is an optimist or a pessimist? Ivashko says that a pessimist is a well-informed optimist but in his work one cannot be a pessimist.

Vishnevskiy asks Ivashko finally how the struggle within the party will end. Ivashko replies: "The party will continue to be sick. The party will recover. Those constructive and sensible forces will gather within it which will be able to implement a sensible policy in the interests of the working man. This is not something I have thought up. It is shown by models based on other countries. The political pendulum swings. You know how often now fervent love turns into hatred and vice versa. This shows itself in different ways. We see this where politicians are concerned, we see it too among television journalists. Today people love them, tomorrow they hate them.

Vishnevskiy concludes the program by thanking Ivashko for taking part.

Regions Barred From Treaty Plan Own Congress

OW1807040991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Spokesmen for the country's regions barred from joining union treaty are planning to hold their own congress in early September. This is stated in an appeal to the Supreme Soviet signed in Moscow recently by the representatives of Moldova's Dniester and Gagauz republics, Georgia's Abkhazian autonomous republic and South- Ossetian autonomous region, Estonia's Interregional council and Lithuania's Shalchininkai region.

KGB School Admits TV Film Crew

OW1807055291 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Jul 91

[Report by V. Bakarinov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Committee for State Security recently invited our film crew to visit the KGB Higher School. Naturally, we do not get such offers very often. In fact, we have never received an offer like this before, so our correspondent immediately jumped at the chance.

[Begin recording] [Bakarinov] Everything that you see here can easily be used for monitoring with high quality and from a considerable distance. [video shows a display of electronic equipment, including a Sony listening device] Meanwhile, as we are being shown how those people who like learning other people's secrets can be prevented from doing so, let me tell you that, according to estimates by Western specialists, those who require information receive 80 percent through space, air, and ground technical intelligence gathering means.

This is the famous lie detector. [video shows a polygraph machine] Despite being widely known, few have seen it.

Here, you see a film taken during the work of an operative team. [video shows divers hauling underwater devices and same devices being dismantled on land] Some time ago, the chekists [KGB agents] managed to find and neutralize a cunning reconnaissance complex installed at the bottom of the Sea of Okhotsk. It comprised metal containers housing the most sophisticated equipment that could monitor all conversations between Kamchatka and the mainland. Each container could gather information for 125 days [as heard] because each had its own source of nuclear energy.

Of course, there are also smaller gadgets. [video shows miniature listening devices and cameras] Recently, we have abandoned spy mania; this is the right thing to do. However, equipment such as this exists and has not been made by the special services merely to exhibit in museums.

It may sound banal, but this is the forge from which personnel who are called upon to defend our huge country come. [video switches to interview with Lieutenant General P.A. Postnikov, director of the Dzerzhinskiy Higher School of the KGB, identified by caption] What do you think? Are you now able to prepare people and make them capable of ensuring the reliable defense of the state?

[Postnikov] We are sure of it. Representatives of literally all the nationalities of the Soviet Union, of all the republics, study here. We are interested in reinforcing our ranks, and we think that such personnel will faithfully serve the interests of our motherland. [end recording]

Kagarlitskiy on Strikes, Workers Movement

PM1607155591 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 13 Jul 91 p B3

[By Boris Kagarlitskiy, sociologist and cofounder of the Socialist Party in the USSR: "Only Strong Trade Unions Can Save the Soviet Union"]

[Text] At the beginning of the eighties, when the whole world was following Solidarity's struggle in Poland with amazement and enthusiasm, Moscow's intellectuals were complaining: "Our workers are not capable of anything like that." Opposition seemed to be something for writers and scientists, the only people capable of understanding the advantages of democracy, and the lack of intellectual freedom was the only thing for which it was possible to engage in serious struggle.

As is generally the case in such situations, both the dissidents and the ruling circles, who fully shared the view of the intellectuals, demonstrated a total inability to understand the actual processes taking place in the country.

When the "era of stability" was replaced by years of tumult and decay (or, in official terminology, "perestroyka") the intelligentsia had an incredibly wide audience. In the pronouncements of writers and the public speeches of scientists people recognized their own fears, their discontent, their own protest. When thousands of people who were not weighed down either by academic titles or higher education went on street demonstrations and then began to strike, the liberal press and opposition politicians suddenly began in their turn—once they had overcome their initial fear and amazement—to say that the working class had "awoken" and demonstrated its "political maturity." Once again this was a mistaken view.

Even though in the last three years the workers movement really has passed through several stages of development, it is impossible to talk of "maturity."

The large-scale miners' strike of 1989 is generally considered to be a turning point. It was a classic strike with spontaneous self-organization by a many-thousand-strong mass, with endless open-air meetings at which people spoke for hours about the most burning questions, with direct democracy when the crowds in the square demanded hourly reports from their leaders, and with a ban on liquor which was introduced by the strikers themselves and was universally respected.

In short, here was everything to delight a 1905-style revolutionary heart. With one exception: The strikers had no political ideology, nor could they have, since there was no organization.

The movement began in a vacuum, as it were. The tradition has been lost; the official trade unions were hostile and helpless. The 1989 strike committees became the first real workers organizations for 60 years—the first, but by no means the best.

The strike committees were immediately swamped by numerous and contradictory duties. At the time of the strike they became, in reality, the only real local power and even after the strikes they retained some powers, and this led to their activists becoming bogged down in meaningless administrative details for which they were totally unprepared. At the same time they had to defend the workers' interests in a situation where there was no workers party and fill the role of trade unions, since the official trade unions were unwilling to do so.

The strike committees, which were rapidly rechristened "workers committees," simply could not handle all these tasks.

The strike committee leaders began to receive invitations to the Kremlin, they received payments for their participation in state commissions set up to monitor the observance of the government's agreements with the miners, they were invited to America, England, and Argentina.

Politicians of all persuasions who before the 1989 strike had shown little interest in the problems of the coal industry began to ingratiate themselves with the miners and from all sides attempts were made to draw the miners closer.

The result was that by the fall of 1989 the workers committees were already in crisis. In almost all mining areas there were scandals about corruption among the leaders, intrigues and schisms began occurring.

From the beginning the miners had tried to avoid politicians. There was a reluctance to provoke the party apparatus and a fear of becoming a toy in the hands of Moscow politicians of this or that persuasion. But it was impossible to avoid politics, and that is why no real political self-determination took place.

Without having clarified the main political issues the miners found themselves drawn into a multitude of political conflicts against their will. The result of this unwillingness to become involved in politics was that the miners became small change in odd political combinations. Hate of Gorbachev and his aides, who carried the responsibility for the country's disintegration and the workers' falling living standards, automatically pushed them into the arms of Yeltsin and his group, although Yeltsin's social and economic program does not bode well for the workers.

Nor were the workers' attempts to create mass organizations crowned with success in 1990. The labor confederation proclaimed in Novo-Kuznetsk during the summer, proved to be incapable of action since it united small workers' clubs, which had survived as if by miracle, with the miners' committees. Apart from the fact that these structures had such disparate amounts of power they did nothing to compensate for each other, for they suffered the same sickness. Some were still incapable of really defending the workers' interests, others had already exhausted their potential to do so.

Even before the miners' strike small independent trade unions (the "Socialist Trade Union", "Independence") had started to come into being, but after the events of that memorable summer they simply began to spring up like mushrooms. However, they all remained as small groups, and many of them engaged not so much in union work as business activity.

The majority of workers stayed in the old unions, because these guarantee access to various social benefits and not even the new trade union centers can provide these.

Another attempt was made under the banner of the "Union of Labor Collectives." The enterprise councils (STK) [Labor Collective Councils], which united in this organization with workers' committees were, as a rule, representative, but scarcely effective. The formation of this union was forced by the government itself when it liquidated the enterprise councils which the authorities themselves had created, since these new bodies could now become an obstacle to privatization. The enterprise councils, which had adopted a resolution opposing privatization at their congress, launched a counterattack. Nevertheless the organization established ties with the Yeltsin group, which had promised to retain the self-governing bodies despite the fact that the Yeltsin program envisages even more far-reaching and widespread privatization.

The miners' strike in the spring of 1991 laid bare all these problems at a stroke. At the same time as the liberal press was writing enthusiastic articles about the miners, the movement found itself in the most profound crisis. Frightening the government with a strike was already an impossibility. No large-scale actions in solidarity followed. Industrial enterprises did go on strike here and there, but these strikes had nothing in common with the miners' action. And there were sharp disagreements between the main regions—Donbass, Kuzbass, Vorkuta, and Karaganda.

A mass movement of the workers is impossible if the industrial workers are not united. The new wave of strikes at industrial enterprises shows that this is possible. The workers' strikes at the AZLK automobile factory and the LLMZ machine-building factory—both in Moscow—show that people are tired of waiting and are ready to defend their interests. The movement here is not growing as rapidly as among the miners, but this is an advantage. New leaders are coming to the fore, such as Vladimir Minayev, chairman of worker representation at LLMZ, for whom the workers' movement does not begin on the first day of a strike. The working class is beginning (only just beginning!) to rediscover its history.

Also, strong workers' organizations are extremely necessary not only for the workers themselves, but also for the country as a whole. The leading circles—in the Union, as well as in the Russian and Baltic republics—are trying to find a way out of the crisis at the expense of the interests of the people. The collapse of the economy is being accompanied by the division of former state property, by unrestrained theft, and by the enrichment of the most dynamic sections of the nomenklatura—both those from the ranks of the Communists and those from among the democrats. The disintegration of enterprises and the chaotic state of the economy are combined with the total lack of interest on the part of those in power in defending the interests of the workers. The threat of terrible unemployment hangs over the country. Living standards are already falling.

Not much remains of the former homogeneity from the "years of stagnation." Not only the bureaucracy, but also the new professional politicians, the intellectual elite, and the most prominent people in the middle stratum of society are very conscious of their interests and are continuing—faithful to the good old tradition—to make these interests out to be those of the whole people and also, in line with the spirit of the times, of the whole of humanity.

Given such arguments, unemployment and even famine appear a comparatively low price to pay for establishing the "sacred principles of private property" (and the division of this property among those who have some power).

The country is sliding toward the abyss, and if it proves impossible to halt this slide, catastrophe is inevitable. The only possible force in whose interest it is to change the course of events is an organized workers' movement which is really independent (not only from the "Communists," but also from the "democrats"). Such a force does not exist yet, but it must come into being.

Throughout the world, trade unions are the main organizations of those who work. Socialist parties have grown up and acquired their power precisely because of their ties with the trade union movement. In the Soviet Union a paradoxical situation has arisen. Europe's largest working class has the most numerous and weakest trade unions. It is scarcely possible to hope that the trade unions, the labor confederation, or the enterprise councils can be turned into a real force. This means that the overwhelming majority of workers remain members of the official trade unions, which is not at all a bad thing.

At the same time as the press reports in detail on the formation of new trade union groups with a few dozen or a few hundred members a complicated process of change has been taking place inside the official trade union. This change has not always been for the better. By calling themselves the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions (FNPR) the official trade unions by no means automatically became an organization of all workers. On the contrary, one could say that the FNPR's leaders are prepared to change master: Instead of the Communists they seem now to be adopting the Russian government, and the FNPR is now being carefully coordinated with the government's activities.

However, there has been renewal at the lower levels. Many new trade union leaders at departmental and enterprise level and elected by collectives in 1989-91 are by no means old-style bureaucrats. Important changes have taken place in the leadership of the Moscow federation of trade unions and other large trade union federations.

The fact that in the 1991 May Day demonstrations people carried banners simultaneously condemning the policies of the "center" and the Russian government and that a grim Gorbachev stood on the tribune of the Lenin Mausoleum without even being able to speak while Moscow People's Deputy Aleksandr Popov of the Socialist Party addressed the crowd means that there is hope of real change in the trade unions.

It is too soon to rejoice over the renewal of the trade unions. But it is no accident that everywhere in East Europe, where the Communist parties are in decline, the official trade unions have as a rule survived and grown stronger and are becoming increasingly able to defend their members' interests. It would seem that in the Soviet Union we are on the brink of a serious struggle to create a really strong and independent trade union power center. This struggle could be successful, basically because there is no other solution.

Union Head on Government's Progress on Accord

914A0935A Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Jul 91 pp 1,2

[Report on interview with V. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR VKP, by TRUD political observer V. Golovachev; place and date not given: "Chairman of the USSR VKP V. Shcherbakov: 'The Unions Do Not Intend To Retreat'; How the Agreement on Labor and Socio-Economic Questions for 1991 Is Being Implemented"]

[Text] **Despite the reassuring statements of V. Pavlov that the slump in production has been successfully stopped and that a final breakdown of the consumer market has been averted, the standard of living in the country continues to drop. And although incomes are increasing, almost nothing can be bought in the empty state stores. But you have to be a millionaire to go to commercial stores. After April's unprecedented increase in prices, they continue to rise, and now not millions, but tens of millions of people find themselves in a distressful position. The specter of unemployment is taking on a real form.**

Under these conditions, the question of the social protection of the workers, and even of the entire population, becomes especially critical. Important guarantees are defined in the agreement which was signed in April between the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Council of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions [VKP]. How is it being implemented? Does the implementation of the agreement help people bear the burdens of the current difficult transition period more easily? Our interview with V. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR VKP, started with these questions.

[Shcherbakov] Life has convincingly confirmed the need for an agreement between the government and the trade unions on labor and socio-economic questions. When we persistently demanded this, the trade unions were accused of populism and efforts to gain cheap popularity among the broad masses, including the fact that implementation of the demands could worsen the situation in the economy even more. Today, it is clear that without such agreements and without a reliable social partnership, the achievement of social peace in the country, pulling out of the crisis, and easing the negative consequences of the switch to the rails of a market economy are impossible.

What was it really possible to achieve? First and foremost, the resolution of such important questions as the legislative consolidation of the principles of calculating the minimal consumer budget (until recently, it was not customary in our country to talk at all about a subsistence level) and the introduction of indexation of incomes of the population. For those periods that were indicated in the agreement, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers prepared the necessary materials, afterwards the USSR president's ukase was published, and the USSR Supreme Soviet passed the principles of legislation.

Today, we still do not feel real feedback from these decisions. But in the very near future, they will have a very direct effect on the standard of living. There was an obvious effort to postpone the introduction of indexation until next year. The tough position of the trade unions prevented this, although, unfortunately, it was not possible to accomplish its implementation starting in the second quarter, and payments are not contemplated until this autumn, if the current growth in prices exceeds the established limits (the indexation threshold). Of course, many republics must still pass laws of direct action. But I do not doubt that, given the active position of the republic trade unions, such decisions in the development of Union legislation will be adopted without fail. Incidentally, the law on indexation is already in effect in Belorussia and Kyrgyzstan.

Quite tangible and rather significant for the budget of every family are sums that remain in the purse as a result of the cancellation of the five percent sales tax on a wide range of commodities and services that are daily necessities. All told, R20 billion were not taken from the population. A special paragraph on the cancellation of this tax was included in the agreement, despite the opposition of the government in the initial stage of negotiations.

Of the 14 paragraphs of the agreement, whose date of fulfillment come due in the first half of the year, eight were completely implemented. I will mention: The amounts of compensation were increased for workers employed in underground and open mine pits in the metallurgical and other branches. Wages are being increased for workers in the health, public education, and cultural branches; additional means have been allocated for subsidies for food allowances for those studying in vocational training schools, for schools, and for students, and the question of the positive changes in the income tax has been resolved... Many other things have also been resolved, which has already been reported in the press.

Quite recently, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers published two more instructions concerning paragraphs written into the agreement. This concerns, first, the consumption fund of enterprises. In particular, if there is money, an enterprise can provide one-time material assistance without particular difficulty in the amount of R1,000 to large families and families with meager means, and also to veterans of labor who are retired. In accordance with the second instruction, the USSR social insurance fund is granted a non- interest-bearing loan in the amount of R1 billion (for compensation of losses in connection with the increase in prices for health center and rest home vouchers, for food for children in health camps, etc.)

[Golovachev] But, after all, the loan will have to be paid back?

[Shcherbakov] Yes, we will take the money, inasmuch as there is no other way as yet. The agreement provided another procedure. It talked about the transfer of R30.2 billion to the USSR social insurance fund. A big part of this amount is formed from insurance dues from enterprises and organizations. But the government agreed to add about R8 billion to the fund in connection with the general increase in prices. As we see, there was no talk of loans of any kind in the agreement. So the billions graciously allocated by the government as loans for the increased expenditures made during the period of the summer health campaign are simply an attempt to create the appearance of a resolution of the question. They explain that there is no money in the Union budget, and no transfers are coming in from the republics. But the question arises, what kind of a center is it that cannot find a common language with the republics? Without the necessary authority in the republic governments, it seems that it will be very difficult for the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to work...

[Golovachev] Vladimir Pavlovich, at the beginning of the interview you cited as one of the positive examples the legislative reinforcement of the principles of calculating the minimal consumer budget. But so far it is not known what the subsistence minimum is in one or another republic, region... But, after all, this is very important to the determination of minimum salaries, pensions, grants, allowances, and even the standard of living in general. How is it that the USSR president's ukase has been adopted, but the matter is not moving?

[Shcherbakov] I would say this: It is moving, but very slowly. Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan have already calculated the subsistence minimum in their republics. But in other regions this work is being held up. And, as always, the central organs of administration are the bottleneck. It is very important to determine the estimated subsistence minimum for the country as a whole. Estimates at the macro-level, budgetary proportions, and the scope of resources necessary for consumer purposes depend on this. But so far the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has not adopted an estimated subsistence minimum for the country. And, it seems, this does not disturb the government very much.

The USSR Ministry of Labor and other economic departments, as far as we know, conducted estimates of the minimal consumer budget. However, the Council of the USSR VKP finds it impossible to agree with them. I do not know what guided the specialists of the governmental organizations, but they grossly violated the recommendations contained in the USSR president's ukase. The ukase very specifically states that it is not price-list prices that should be used as the basis for the estimates, but real purchase prices. What sense does it make if price-list listings, for example, show summer pants for R23. Probably no one even intends to produce them. To base an estimate on such mythical prices means to deliberately deceive the people.

Meanwhile, specialists of the USSR Ministry of Labor used minimal price-list prices in their calculations on nonfood commodities. Although it was entirely possible to determine the average real prices for purchasing the necessary range of commodities and services. At least, trade union specialists conducted an analysis of established prices on a number of commodities in 91 cities for two whole weeks. Incidentally, the investigations showed that in a majority of the cities a man's suit, for example, could be bought at a price no lower than R200. But Ministry of Labor estimates put the cost of a suit at only R137. Who needs such unrealistic calculations? Will this deception not lead to mass indignation and an increase in social tension? I think that this is a very dangerous path. And, therefore, we are telling the people about this today for everyone to hear. We cannot allow the subsistence minimum to be built on a false foundation.

[Golovachev] Unemployment, which is becoming a real factor in our life, is among the most critical problems today. How is the agreement being implemented in this respect?

[Shcherbakov] It must be said frankly that the country was not completely ready for this extremely negative phenomenon. In accordance with the agreement, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers was supposed to approve the official all-Union program for guaranteeing employment back in May. However, the USSR Ministry of Labor has not yet completed its study. After all, it is this program that is supposed to stipulate territories for priority development and economic measures to stimulate the creation of new jobs, the training and retraining of personnel, etc. Indeed, on the whole, the implementation of a number of important provisions of the Principles of Legislation on Employment of the Population is lagging behind significantly. In a number of republics, laws on direct action have not been adopted, which provides practically no opportunity to carry out the social protection of citizens who become unemployed. In a word, a lot of work remains here for the Union and republic governments and for the trade unions.

[Golovachev] A lot of complaints come to the editorial office from workers at clubs, palaces of culture, and sports facilities that are part of the trade union system. They write that in contrast to analogous state establishments, their salaries have not been increased. Very frequently they do not even receive compensation in connection with retail price increases. Is this really fair?

[Shcherbakov] This question really troubles us a great deal. The situation is more than strange. For example, there are two stadiums—one state, and the other—union. The personnel perform the very same work, but the salaries differ sharply. The whole problem is that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers did not allocate the means for the trade union budget to increase the salaries of workers in the cultural-educational, non-school, mass physical culture sports establishments that belong to or are used by the trade unions, and also for payment of compensation. The government found a convenient way out—transfer the resolution of the question to the republics. Thereby, the government once again violated the agreement. Now, under pressure from republic trade union organizations, the matter is moving quietly off dead center, although there is a lot of work to be done here also.

[Golovachev] And the last question. The creation of the Democratic Reform Movement can significantly change the arrangement of political forces in the country. It will, I think, have a noticeable influence on the government of the country and on the USSR president. What does the trade union think of the idea of establishing such a movement?

[Shcherbakov] There is one criterion here: If the aims and tasks of any social force and movement correspond to the aims and tasks of the trade unions to consolidate the social gains of the workers, then it can confidently count on our support and partnership. The important thing is only that these aims are not a screen and not a disguise for the resolution of quite different political tasks. Unfortunately, lately almost all talk is about their aspirations to achieve the social protection of the workers, but in practice this conceals an effort to return the country either to dogmatic neo-Bolshevism, or to anarchic disorder, or something else again, without asking the workers' opinions. And all under the flag of protecting their interests.

As for the Democratic Reform Movement, its proclamation of humanistic principles does not differ from that for which the trade unions, the USSR VKP, are fighting. That is why we are supporting this movement. The social direction of reform is very important to us. The country is getting a chance to unite the progressive forces for a decisive movement forward along the path of democratic and radical reorganizations. People of various parties and of various political orientations can be participants in this creative process. Today, in the steep turn of history, such a consolidation is necessary to a country that is exhausted from upheavals.

TASS Reviews 18 Jul Soviet Central Press

LD1807075291 Moscow TASS in English 0538 GMT 18 Jul 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 18 TASS—Newspapers open their front pages today with reports about President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to London, his bilateral meetings with several leaders of the Group of Seven top industrialised nations and talks he had with all G-7 leaders at London's Lancaster House.

PRAVDA and other newspapers highlight Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. President George Bush on Wednesday. The meeting became a new milestone in the high-level Soviet-American dialogue, participants said.

At a press conference after the meeting Gorbachev and Bush announced that they have agreed on the date for the Moscow summit: Bush will arrive in Moscow on July 30.

The two presidents said they resolved the remaining issues on the start treaty at their Wednesday's meeting.

PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, TRUD, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA cover Gorbachev's talks with President Francois Mitterrand of France, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development Chairman Jacques Attali.

Gorbachev's meeting with G-7 leaders at Lancaster House was held behind close doors, newspapers report. Gorbachev and British Prime Minister John Major spoke to reporters about the meeting at a press conference on Wednesday evening.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries a more detailed report about the meeting, including six proposals by the G-7 to the Soviet Union aimed to strengthen cooperation.

Newspapers also cover the G-7 summit in London that ended before talks with Gorbachev began. The leaders of the G-7 nations agreed to promote the role of the United Nations in establishing a new world order, work toward a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round and maintain a constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union, which has embarked on comprehensive reforms.

Participants passed three "declarations and praised the forum as "very useful".

PRAVDA publishes Gorbachev's greetings to participants in the first Iberoamerican meeting of heads of state and government from Latin America, Spain, and Portugal in Guadalajara, Mexico.

The message sent to President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico says that the meeting "will make a major contribution to global integration, democratisation and equal cooperation, while respecting uniqueness and a free choice".

PRAVDA carries an interview with Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis. He praised the level of Soviet-Greek relations, saying there are good opportunities to expand them. These relations could [words indistinct] countries, he said. Mitsotakis also spoke about several international issues and said Greece supported the idea to set up a Black Sea cooperation zone. Russia's Congress of People's Deputies adjourned until autumn in Moscow on Wednesday, failing to elect a new chairman of the republic's parliament, newspapers report.

The forum did not meet expectations, failing to resolve most issues on its agenda, TRUD writes.

In the meantime, the parliament will be chaired by first Deputy Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov. The congress ended "cheerlessly and mundanely", PRAVDA writes.

Newspapers report developments in Yugoslavia and continued attempts to find a political compromise to prevent its break up.

Economic

Primakov Interviewed on Economic Reform

LD1707191591 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Interview with Yevgeniy Primakov, President Gorbachev's special envoy, by correspondent Jon Snow in London on 15 July; from the "Channel 4 News" program—recorded]

[Text] [Snow] Well, I've been talking to President Gorbachev's special envoy Yevgeniy Primakov and I put it to him that the economic reform plan, which the Soviets have brought to London, is not radical enough to satisfy the West.

[Primakov] You in Great Britain, you had privatized 17 percent during 12 years. You want us to do it, like this [snaps fingers] in our country. I don't think that it's seriously [as heard]. But, even in this circumstance we are ready to privatize about 80 percent of small and middle-scale enterprises operating in the trade, in the services, during the coming two years.

[Snow] There is a rumor that Mr. Yavlinskiy, who has played such an important part in constructing this plan, is not happy with the document that you have brought with you.

[Primakov] I am not with those who think in this way, because, I met Mr. Yavlinskiy before my leaving; and of course he has some reservations, of course, it is quite natural. But, I can't say that Yavlinskiy was against this message which I brought here to Mr. Major.

[Snow] One other thing that people have been saying is that they cannot understand why the military still needs such a very big budget, that this plan still seems to foresee big expenditure on military....

[Primakov, interrupting] First of all, we have in mind to reduct [as heard] this military expenditure, and we're saying loudly about this. You see, that the level of military expenditure is connected with the sufficient defense.

[Snow] So, how can we judge this week? I mean, it is an extraordinary event: the Soviet leader meeting with the seven industrialized leading nations. How can we judge whether it has been a success or not? What is the minimum you need to leave with?

[Primakov] First of all, don't think that we are too naive, that we want to come back with the buckets, with money, with everything. We don't consider all this as the accord, one-time accord. It is the very beginning of the process for us, the very beginning of the process of involvement into the world economy. That's why I do believe that we could—and we should—have here the political support of our course, and of course some kind of help, or assistance of—yes, assistance—let's say so.

[Snow] So, what is on the table is only a beginning, and it is possible to radicalize that once the process has started.

[Primakov] Yes, yes. You are right. I am answering without any hesitation. You are right.

[Snow] And finally, you talk of the Soviet Union surviving this process. It is a very, very difficult process. Will Mr. Gorbachev and his leadership survive this process?

[Primakov] I do believe that Mr. Gorbachev, our president, is the key figure in this process. Without him everything would be jeopardized so much that we can't think about the light at the end of the tunnel. You see, it's first, and secondly, I do believe that he will stay, and he will strengthen his position.

State Bank Balance Published, Viewed

PM1707110191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[Gosbank report followed by correspondent V. Romanyuk comment: "Gosbank's Last 'Secrets'"]

[Text]**Consolidated Balance (Including Operations of Republics' Central Banks) of USSR Gosbank [State Bank] as of 1 January 1991**

[In the first column of figures in the following table the letters A and B refer to footnotes]

			(million rubles)
Assets	Sum	Liabilities	Sum
Precious metals-.foreign currency	1,180.6A	Bank notes and money in circulation	136,100.0
Funds in current accounts, in investments, in foreign bank deposits	87.7	Funds in state budgets accounts	20,204.8
Credits to commercial banks	119,469.2	Funds in commercial banks' correspondent accounts	30,487.7
Securities	49,100.0	Commercial banks' compulsory reserves	8,636.6
Credits to USSR Ministry of Finances and Union republic ministries of finances	462,060.1B	Deposits to be called for by enterprises, associations, organizations, and citizens	61,280.7
Fixed capital	1,055.9	Other banks' credits	368,813.0
Other assets	5,411.2	Statutory fund	650.0
		Reserve and other funds	1,688.5
		Other liabilities	10,120.1
		Profit	383.3
Balance	638,364.7	Balance	638,364.7

(Footnote A) (including 374,561,420.6 grammes of gold at the price of one ruble per gramme of gold).

(Footnote B) (including credits to union republics' ministries of finances—23,646.9 million rubles).

[Signed] V.V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR Gosbank

S.F. Kotelnikov, chief accountant of the USSR Gosbank.

IZVESTIYA Correspondent Comments And so we are renewing after a huge break—for the first time since 1936!—the open publication of the USSR Gosbank's consolidated balance—the holy of holies of an authoritarian state. The very fact that this document has appeared on the eve of the USSR president's meeting with the members of the "big seven" is evidence of our serious intention to make real headway toward the market, toward civilized commodity-money relations. Incidentally, openness in this sphere is a most important condition in deciding the question of our country's entry into the IMF, the World Bank, and other international financial organizations. And indeed the law on banks and banking adopted last year provided for the publication of the USSR Gosbank consolidated balance.

What does the balance submitted reflect? Above all what our central bank has—the bank's assets of slightly more than 638 billion rubles [R]. And it is not a question of whether that is a lot or not but of what the money of the country's chief bank is spent on. In the opinion of USSR Gosbank Deputy Chairman A. Voylukov, the balance was excessively weighed down by credits to the Union Ministry of Finances and the republics' ministries of finances—over R426 billion were swallowed up by credits of this kind while the republics' share looks extremely modest (R23.6 billion).

It is accepted in the world that the Ministry of Finances must borrow money from enterprises and the population, and they certainly invest money in particular programs if they see sense in doing so. But in our country the Ministry of Finances is... supported by the state. It is true that the first steps have been taken on the path of developing the securities market. And the R49.1 billion which figure in the assets is a promising start. On the other hand the number of bank notes in circulation is assessed by specialists as excessive and this is explained by the underdevelopment of the noncash form of accounts and, once again, by the weakness of the securities market.

The published balance in many ways reflects the transitional period both of our economy as a whole and of the formation of a two-tier banking system. For instance, funds in commercial banks' correspondent accounts are expressed in a sum of slightly over R30 billion. But this banking structure itself has not yet been formed and therefore the picture is incomplete. Mutual relations are changing between Gosbank and enterprises, which have finally begun to receive interest for their free funds kept in the USSR Gosbank.

Finally, let us say that idle false rumors about the real gold backup for Soviet currency should end with the publication of the consolidated balance. No, these are not worthless pieces of paper! The bank notes and coins in circulation in our country are have an adequately solid backup of precious metals and foreign currency and a gold backup of 374.5 tonnes (374,561,420.6 grammes).

The opening of our financial balances is also an important step toward the ruble's real convertibility. Let us also say that the publication of the consolidated balance—as of 1 January 1991—was somewhat late. Arnold Vasilyevich Voylukov assured me that balances will now be published every quarter. It is true that the first quarter of the year has been passed over for understandable reasons: the prices reform and a number of other factors got in the way. The next balance will reflect the situation as of 1 July 1991.

Dollar Soars Against Ruble on Currency Market

PM1707132691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by I. Zhagel: "Currency Dealers Went on Strike: And the Rate Soared to R60 a Dollar"]

[Text] The latest auction on the currency exchange, which took place 16 July, brought an unfortunate new record. The rate soared to 60 rubles [R] for one U.S. dollar. In just one week it has "climbed" by more than R10.

The main reason for this steep decline on the currency exchange is the shortage of supply. It is no coincidence that in July one auction did not take place at all, while the volume of currency sales at the others totaled less than $9 million, whereas in June more than $25 million were sold. This can be regarded as a kind of strike by the currency dealers in response to the stepping up of the tax burden by the USSR Ministry of Finance. IZVESTIYA (No. 144) has already written about this, but a month ago the process of restricting currency receipts at the exchange was only just beginning, whereas now it can be said to have reached its peak.

At the latest auction only just over 3 million U.S. dollars were offered for sale—the smallest sum in the last two months. And it was only when the rate soared from R49.6 to R60 that a further $700,000 was released onto the market. Obviously we are not going to achieve stabilization of the situation on the currency market by twisting the arms and squeezing the pockets of the currency dealers.

But today our currency market is itself highly unusual in nature. It exists, so to speak, in isolation from the whole of the rest of the economy. And indeed, you would hardly find another country where such a decline in the value of the national currency in relation to other countries' currencies would be so calmly received and have virtually no effect on the entire national economy.

In effect the greater part of our industry is not in any way involved in the currency market. And how, indeed, could any enterprise buy currency at that exchange rate, so as to spend it on buying equipment? Only a machine to make gold from thin air would pay for itself on those terms. And A. Potemkin, director of the currency exchange, confirmed that all the currency now being bought is being used to buy the scarcest goods. This in effect is a continuation of the pernicious practice whereby hard-earned marks, pounds, and dollars, as in former years, are eaten up in our country, rather than helping to renew our industry and bring in new technologies.

The solution to the situation is both simple and difficult. To stop the speculative demand for currency, it is certainly necessary first and foremost to reduce centralized redistribution of currency to a minimum, find potential for extensive intervention by currency resources from state organs, change the taxation and customs policy, and deregulate prices.

Foreign Trade Turnover Falls 37 Percent

OW1807052691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to data received by IF [INTERFAX], in the first half of this year the Soviet Union's foreign trade turnover made up 77.5 billion roubles, as calculated by the State Bank. This shows a 37.1 percent decrease against the same period last year. The exports made up 41.2 billion roubles and imports 36.3 billion, or 76.6 percent and 52.3 percent of last year's level respectively.

Agricultural

CPSU's Stroyev on Agrarian Sector's Plight

PM1807100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Ye. Stroyev, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "The Market in the Peasant Dimension"]

[Text] No matter how much science and technology progress, for the foreseeable future people will continue feeding themselves from the land. From the thin layer of its surface that is called soil. From the most ancient times to our day, concern for our daily bread has exercised and continues to exercise mankind's best minds and all society.

This topic is of special importance for our country. Because one-third of the population, or 97 million people, live in the countryside. That is why we cannot view their situation with indifference. But peasants do not feed only themselves—they feed the country. Quite a lot is being said today about how they cope with that task. But are words necessary here? You only have to look at the shelves in the stores. Food shortages are giving rise not just to criticisms but to people's grave discontent.

Our peasantry has long been viewed as a backward, conservative, historically transitional class in need of the proletariat's leadership. For decades the countryside was portrayed as an "internal colony." It was used as a source of food and financial, human, and spiritual resources. The accelerated transfer of its economic and intellectual potential led to the destruction of the whole tenor of rural life and a colossal demographic switch. In the lifetime of a single generation, the proportion of the country's urban population increased from 20 percent to 70 percent. The countryside has been depopulated and its population's average age has increased. Thousands of population centers with a history going back through the centuries have ceased to exist. In the past three years the number of kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers has fallen by 15 percent or 3.1 million people. There is a shortage of 198,000 milkmaids and 700,000 machine operators alone.

Having bled the countryside white, industry has still not given it either a sufficiently effective system of machines, a good processing base, or other essential resources. Worse still, in the past five years, annual supplies of individual means of production to the countryside have fallen 12-50 percent. The supply of spares, fuel, construction materials, and metal has deteriorated sharply, and the production of tractors, vehicles, combine harvesters, and chemical plant protection agents has declined.

Over 300 technological operations in the countryside are performed manually today. They employ 12 million people or one-half of the active labor resources. Indeed, all they can do is feed themselves.

Furthermore, the price reform which began 1 January this year grossly violated price parity for industrial and agricultural output. Compulsory procurements in conditions of non-equivalent exchange are turning the agrarian sector into a hopeless debtor. Farms cannot buy tractors or combine harvesters or build a livestock unit or housing. No wonder people say: The price reform is being carried out behind the peasant's back and at his expense. After all, the extra costs incurred by the agro-industrial complex as a result of the rise in the price of material resources, services, taxes, and compensation are going up by more than 80 billion rubles [R]. But the whole profit for last year amounted to R57.7 billion. Thus, whereas after the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum price parity was maintained, this year it has been upset to an unprecedented degree. It continues to pit the city against the countryside. Which gravely worries people.

It is not just the backward farms that are sounding the alarm but the economically powerful ones, too. Even they could not withstand the price aggression which has still not stopped. Unlike the majority of city dwellers, peasants pay to build their own housing, too. To own a home, a peasant now needs to invest R100,000-R120,000. A whole lifetime is hardly enough to amass such a sum. Especially since pay for labor in the countryside is considerably lower than in the city.

Thus the agrarian sector is again being viewed as an inexhaustible source to cover budget deficits. What question can there be of developing a mixed economy and private farming if even large and prosperous farms have begun talking loudly about ruin? This cry from the heart, as it were, was also sounded in speeches by delegates to the second stage of the USSR Peasant Union Constituent Congress.

The impression is being created that there really exists in the country an anti-agrarian lobby which penetrated every pore of the structures of power. It seems not to see how the humbled, injured, and fleeced countryside is suffering. But when it suffers, the whole people suffer.

There have been numerous promises to resolve the food question. But as soon as it comes down to practical implementation, dozens of reasons are found to explain why the plan has not been carried out. That was what happened with the development of the Non-Chernozem Zone, that is what is happening now with the retooling of the food sectors and the broad participation of the defense industry complex in this work.

The Joint CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission April (1991) Plenum expressed profound concern at the deterioration in the peasantry's life. It stated that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers must define specific measures and material and financial resources to give real priority to the agro-industrial complex.

Recently the Central Committee Commission on CPSU agrarian policy examined the question of maintaining price parity for the output of agriculture and other sectors in 1991. Its participants—and they were major specialists, scientists, and party, soviet, and economic leaders—came to the unanimous opinion: If parity is not restored without delay, agricultural production will fall, the financial and economic activity of agrarian complex enterprises will be paralyzed, and the migration of the rural population will intensify. Then neither ration cards, nor coupons, nor strikes will help.

The Cabinet of Ministers seemed to have recognized the need for measures to restore social justice for the peasantry. The resolution "On Compensation in 1991 for the Additional Costs of Enterprises and Organizations in the Agro-Industrial Complex in Connection with the Reform of Price Formation" was adopted. But it hardly resolves the problem. The state coffers are empty. Thus the planned measures are mainly recommendations in character. Although some practical steps have been taken. In particular, permission has been granted to sell 30 percent of output at contract prices. Other incentives are planned to replenish the state's food resources. But the bulk of compensation to the countryside is now borne by the republics.

Belorussia, for example, intends to fully compensate the additional costs incurred by agro-industrial complex enterprises and organizations as a result of the rise in retail prices. Including the higher cost of material and technical resources and construction. The means for this are allocated both from the budget and by using part of the profit from other sectors. Peasants are receiving active help in the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. And this is already beginning to have a positive effect on production results. But where the agrarian sector has been neglected because of political passions, the drop in the production and sale of meat and milk has reached 45-52 percent. That has never happened before in the history of our agriculture.

Alarming trends are being observed in Russia. Here the countryside is receiving only one-half the budget resources and one-third the compensation for the rise in price of material and technical resources and services. The decisions of the Second Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies on this question are not being fulfilled. According to calculations by the republic's Ministry of Agriculture, R40 billion will be taken from the agro-industrial complex because of the price discrepancy. The Non-Chernozem Zone is in a particularly difficult situation.

Thus market phraseology alone will not get you far. To resolve the food problem it is necessary to invest material, financial, and intellectual resources in the agro-industrial complex. The countryside has grown tired of believing and waiting. And if it does not get help today, tomorrow it will need tremendous efforts to maintain at least the level of production that has been achieved.

That is why the principled questions of agrarian policy are being discussed so keenly now at plenums, the Secretariat, and the Commission of the Central Committee and are being submitted for examination by the government and the president of the country.

Even though the country's budget is overstretched and the state and government do not have surplus resources, it will still be necessary to find them. Perhaps as a matter of urgency, in emergency conditions. Because grain has always been our main asset. Neither vehicles nor machines will be set in motion without it. And it is not a question of charity or handouts but of equal conditions for economic activity. People can hardly watch calmly while lots of cooperatives get fat, individual industrial enterprises live high on the hog, but the peasants are needy. Judge for yourselves: Whereas across the country as a whole at the beginning of the current year there were R31 billion of available money in the accounts of industrial enterprises, by 1 June that figure had already risen to R68 billion. And this is despite the strikes and the fall in production. At the same time kolkhozes and sovkhozes do not have the means to pay wages.

If we are moving to the market, the peasant must enter it in the role not of supplicant but of fully-fledged partner. It is necessary to accelerate the strenghtening and development of the single system of agricultural machine building, the construction industry base, and the servicing of agro-industrial complex enterprises and to restore the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply to Agriculture.

To avoid a sharp rise in prices for food in market conditions it is necessary to make full use of stabilization measures. To reduce the cost price of agricultural produce, the state must bear the cost of the construction and operation of social facilities—housing, roads, and gas supply—as has long been the case in cities. It is called on to protect the countryside against monopolism in price formation for equipment and other resources and to ensure preferential credit through the peasant bank. Ultimately this must be a question of pursuing a protectionist policy with regard to the agrarian sector. That is what happens in all developed countries.

Recently a definite resistance has appeared toward the party's chosen course of implementing conversion in the interests of the countryside. The program is being disrupted in practice even though the proportion of machine building for the food industry in the military-industrial complex sectors is no more than 3-5 percent. Thus there is no question of overburdening that complex.

The laws of the market are remorseless. They have no room for freeloading or incompetence. The winner is the one who achieves the highest labor productivity with the lowest costs. That is why a mixed economy is being created on the basis of different forms of ownership and management. The development of this process must not be slowed down but must be promoted through the changing of production relations within kolkhozes and sovkhozes, leasing, cooperation, stock issue, the creation of family farms and peasant holdings, and the strengthening of private plots. The peasant must be given the opportunity to dispose of the results of his labor. Then he will have powerful incentives and a desire to master the achievements of scientific and technical progress. And specialists and leaders will make full use of their talents and abilities for the first time. There are quite a few talented people among them who are utterly devoted to the cause. It is important to preserve and multiply this mighty intellectual potential of the countryside as much as possible. It needs that potential now more than ever before. With the development of the mixed economy demands on specialists are changing, too. The farmer, for example, is also a machine operator, an accountant, a technologist, and a salesman. Hence the new approaches to the formation of training programs and the organization of the training process itself. The country has still not been freed from the administrative burden, it has not gained full freedom. The infrastructure is not developed, especially in the sphere of the procurement, storage, processing, and transportation of agricultural produce. This sphere is still not capable of engaging in truly market operations and the competitive struggle and the search for sellers and customers. Without those levers the market will remain a slave market.

We are at the very beginning of the path. The development of diverse forms of ownership and management and rivalry and competition is being held back by the fact that there is still no full clarity on questions of denationalization and privatization, nor is there experience even though the relevant laws have been adopted. Yet this is the cornerstone of the economic reform. It is no coincidence that many disputes and debates are developing around it.

The production of the main output—grain and meat—cannot be increased more quickly without market levers. For the production of these most important products it is necessary to create a most-favored status which uses financial and resource incentives. Without the agrarian sector there can be no market at all. That is why more effective and more radical approaches are needed from party organizations toward various aspects of the development of the agro-industrial complex and its integration ties. The most important task now is to gather the harvest, ensure procurements in the necessary quantities, and give people in harveesting work all the conditions for highly productive labor. That is where Communists and local soviets can show their full potential.

The stabilization of the country's sociopolitical life can be approached through improving people's prosperity. It cannot be denied that, in order to achieve the aim, it is worth pooling the efforts of all society.

Price Discrepancies Blamed for Sectoral Plight

PM1807085991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Second Edition p 1

["Current Topic" article by Ye. Grigoryev: "To Starve Us Out? Why Peasants Are Declaring 'Moratorium' on Deliveries of Output"]

[Text] I would not wish to dramatize events, but the situation is extremely alarming. The countryside is starting to show distrust in the state's agrarian policy. Here is what has happened in Nizhniy Novgorod Oblast. The local Union of Agrarian Workers announced its intention to suspend all deliveries of meat stocks for 15 days. Why exactly are the peasants taking such extreme measures and, as the saying goes, starving us out?

People are fed up with hearing talk about the need for an equal partnership between city and countryside. It is clear to everyone that if it is economically substantiated and organizationally consolidated, there will be more supplies in the stores. But alas, whether because of certain reasons or "strategic" schemes that are beyond our ken, or because of a lack of understanding, the state is sticking to unilateralism: It is taking more resources out of the countryside than it is putting in. And this practice is continuing today. Unless it is changed, a large proportion of kolkhozes and sovkhozes will hit the rocks.

Such is the bitter prospect. And it is no good being surprised by it. Let us glance at the price list for industrial goods. Previously a farm paid 15,500 rubles [R] for a K-701 tractor. It now pays R57,700. The figures for a "Niva" combine harvester are R7,000 and R20,000 respectively. And those for a KSK-100 silage corn harvesting combine—R15,000 and R59,000 respectively. That is, the cost of industrial products, construction materials, and fertilizers has increased by a factor of three, four, or more, while purchase prices for agricultural products have increased on average by a factor of 1.5.

It is especially hard for farms engaged in stockbreeding. Because purchase prices for milk and meat by no means guarantee the sector's profitability and do not create an economic interest in raising stock units' output. The production of meat and milk has become not just an unprofitable business but a ruinous one. Even the economically strong and nationally famous "Rassvet" Kolkhoz in Mogilev Oblast's Kirovskiy Rayon did not hold out under the pressure of astronomic prices. People here are quickly putting pigs and cows to the knife in order to reduce the losses from rearing them. And these losses are not small. In the first quarter alone, the farm incurred a loss of R370,000 from the sale of meat and milk. And it is like that in many places. Let us ponder: They are putting to the knife the herd that should feed us tomorrow.

The financial squeeze is doing its dirty work throughout the country. During the first five-month period, compared with last year, meat production fell 12 percent, milk production by 11 percent, and eggs production by 6 percent. The headcount of livestock and poultry is falling. For how much longer will this continue? So far there is no real economic basis for stopping the slump. True, the government and the country's president have promised to consider anew the questions of prices for agricultural and industrial products, of establishing fairer taxation, and of paying compensation to farms for losses incurred by them in the first half-year because of the price discrepancy.

However, currently the compensation payment mechanism is such that it is not bringing greater relief to farms.

The matter is also aggravated by the city's neglect of its sponsorship duties. Last fall the peasant was left to cope with the harvest all on his own. The result was lamentable. Almost 6 million hectares of grain crops, 1 million hectares of sunflowers, and 400,000 hectares of potatoes and vegetables were buried under the snow.

The peasants are drawing their conclusion from the bitter lesson. Since the city's help is unreliable, we will cut production and reduce deliveries of products under the state order. And stocks will start bypassing stores and meat and dairy combines, going straight to the monopolists in machine building and to the holders of stocks of construction materials, fertilizers, and mixed feeds. Barter has an enviable appetite but, with the store shelves empty, what will happen to pensioners, employees, and students? The time has come to radically change the commodity exchange between city and countryside and make it advantageous to the countryside.

And before something really serious happens, that is to say a real famine, the country has to be fed. Whether this is achieved via fixed prices for industrial goods, payments to supplement farms' earnings from the sale of produce, priority taxation, or organizing a "Support Fund" is not that important. The important point is to ensure normal conditions for running farms profitably.

Report Surveys Weather, Crop Conditions

PM1807091991 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Jul 91 p 2

[Agrometeorologist N. Ignatova report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] The heat has finally abated over most of the Volga Valley, Volga-Vyatka, Central Chernozem, and central regions, which were hit by drought at the beginning of July. Rain has fallen, and in some places it has been heavy. The drought is also over in the Urals region, and there has been an improvement in grain harvest formation conditions and the availability of moisture for the crops.

In the southern half of the Volga Valley region and most of Rostov Oblast, winter grain crops have ripened, but the ear is small and the grain in it is underdeveloped. Full grain ripeness in winter crops has also been noted in the southern Ukraine and over the entire territory of the North Caucasus and the Lower Volga Valley. South of the line linking Ternopol, Tula, Kirov, and Perm, grain has reached the stage of waxy ripeness, and north of this line it has reached milky ripeness.

The corn in almost all regions has continued to form leaves rapidly. Conditions for the formation of corn grain have been favorable in the Ukraine, Krasnodar Kray, the west of Stavropol Kray, the North Caucasus republics, and the Transcaucasus.

In most beet-sowing regions the availability of moisture for the crops is sufficient but, on the whole, sugar beet roots have been growing in higher soil temperature. According to preliminary estimates, the weight of the root in the Central Chernozem region and the beet-sowing oblasts of the Volga Valley region is somewhat greater than last year; in the North Caucasus it is the same as last year, and in the Ukraine it is somewhat less.

On the whole the development of potatoes is seven to 10 days ahead of the long-term average. Formation of flower clusters and blossom in potato plants has been noted everywhere, and only in southernmost regions has blossoming come to an end.

Flax is blossoming everywhere in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. The seeds of plants sown early have begun to ripen in Kostroma and Vologda Oblasts.

The mass harvesting of grasses has been carried out almost everywhere. Hot and mainly dry weather has been recorded in Central Asian republics and the southern half of Kazakhstan, as a result of which the delay in the development of cotton plants and other heat-loving crops has been reduced somewhat.

Scientific

Spaceplane Designers Outline Research Trends

PM1707110291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

[Article by A. Tupolev, aircraft general designer; G. Zagaynov, chief of the Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute; D. Ogorodnikov, chief of the Central Aviation Engine Building Institute; and V. Chepkin, power unit general designer, under "Science Fiction Blueprints" rubric: "To Mars by... Airplane"]

[Text] "Earth is the cradle of reason. But we cannot live in the cradle forever," our great compatriot K.E. Tsiolkovskiy said.

Experience gained in space exploration over a comparatively short historical period already demonstrates fairly graphically that if used rationally for the purposes of establishing communication and navigation systems, producing new materials and compounds, and studying the earth's surface, space opens up huge possibilities for mankind.

A fundamentally new field that has been studied intensively of late by the world's leading aerospace firms is a single-stage reusable spaceplane.

Extensive programs in this field are being conducted in the United States, Japan, and other countries. These programs are set to run for 10-16 years, and it is intended to spend between $3.5 billion and $16 billion on them. In the experts' opinion, the implementation of these programs will make it possible not only to develop a fundamentally new class of flying machines, but also to develop promising technologies that will set the standard for these countries' technical development at the start of the 21st century.

Today the Soviet aviation industry has available the scientific and technical groundwork that would enable it to set about designing an experimental spaceplane. Bearing in mind the importance of this program for the country's technical development, and also the considerable expenditure required to implement it, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev has decided to submit the basic outlines of this program for open discussion by the scientific and technical community, and also to examine possible ways of organizing international cooperation. It also seems advisable to us to hold hearings on this program in the appropriate USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. This program should be open and subject to glasnost, which will undoubtedly assist its implementation and help to attract the country's best scientific and engineering forces to the realization of the project.

In putting forward the basic outlines of the program to construct a spaceplane, we should note that in this instance the basic principle of aviation is preserved, and the aircraft will be capable of making a total of 100-150 flights in space. Finally, it is "single-stage" because the same vehicle that took off from the airfield goes into orbit. There are no detachable sections here.

This spaceplane will take off from an ordinary airfield and provide a regular service to deliver payload into near-earth orbit at a considerably reduced unit delivery cost.

The spaceplane will be multipurpose, with unique system features: short reaction time, general-purpose capability, and self-contained and flexible utilization.

The question arises: Why did we earth dwellers not open up space using spaceplanes before? The scientific and technical standard of aerospace designs was not up to the task of building a spaceplane. Besides which, the development of technology is determined by the economic, ecological, political, and conceptual demands which society makes of it. In future we inhabitants of the earth will be required to significantly increase the number of "earth to orbit to earth" flights and to increase the flow of freight while reducing costs. It is also essential to improve the ecological characteristics of space rocket systems, to put a stop to the pollution of space with spent sections of rockets, and to significantly reduce or even do away with territories that have been set aside for the spent stages to fall to earth. Therefore the leading world powers are intensifying their search for new and more efficient ways of reaching near-earth space.

The most promising of all the areas being looked at, albeit the one that necessitates solving the most complex problems in order for it to be implemented, is the single-stage fully reusable spaceplane. For several years now, our organizations have been studying the possibility of implementing this idea in a spaceplane that is being designed at general designer A.A. Tupolev's Experimental Design Bureau.

Work carried out by designers and research conducted by scientists at the N.Ye. Zhukovskiy Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute show that an aircraft of this type could be constructed.

The construction of a spaceplane will become possible only as a result of exceptional and revolutionary achievements in materials science, technology, engine construction, instrumentation, and extensive application of supercomputer-based computer systems. Let us take the design of the aircraft's airframe as an example. In aviation design there is a parameter that characterizes weight efficiency,—the fuel ratio, that is to say the amount of fuel the aircraft can carry on board at takeoff. Previously we established the record with the Antonov An-25 aircraft, which on flights to the United States via the North Pole carried a fuel load equivalent to 54 percent of its takeoff weight. But the An-25 had an airspeed of only 200 kilometers per hour. A very large quantity of fuel needs to be stored on a spaceplane—over 65 percent of its takeoff weight, and in view of a number of requirements this fuel could be liquid hydrogen, which is 11 times less dense than kerosene. The fuselage must be of a considerable size. Moreover, as it accelerates in the atmosphere, the spaceplane reaches speeds 10 times greater than that of aircraft, and the surface temperature, particularly on the leading edges, can exceed 2,000 degrees centigrade. It is necessary to come up with an inconceivably lightweight and durable design capable of withstanding high temperatures. Calculations show, for example, that in order to work, the design for a fuel tank with cryogenic liquid hydrogen (at a temperature of minus 250 degrees centigrade) must weigh just 20 kg per square meter of surface area, whereas the current design of a similar sort of nonreusable tank on the "space shuttle" weighs over 30 kg per square meter.

It is obvious that in order to come up with such a unique design, it is not enough just to improve the strength and heat resistance properties of existing materials. The manufacture of fundamentally new materials with vastly improved properties is required, for example alloys or compounds with the strength of titanium and the density of aluminum that work at the sort of temperatures to which modern heat-resistant steels are subjected.

Research that has been carried out has demonstrated that this is not science fiction. There are a number of ways in which the aforementioned requirements can be implemented. Coordinated work must be done by a number of enterprises in the aviation industry, metallurgy, and other sectors, and specific material and financial resources must be allocated.

All modern systems of placing space vehicles in orbit use rocket engines powered by on-board fuel and oxidizer reserves. Atmospheric air is certainly not used and only creates dangerous resistance. If atmospheric air is used as the oxidizer for engines, on the aircraft principle, the efficiency of the power unit can be increased many times. True, this requires air-jet engines which must work effectively at flight speeds several times faster than those of the fastest modern aircraft, and must also be twice as light as current models.

The fuel, too, must be considerably more efficient than kerosene, which is what today's aircraft normally use. The most suitable fuel is liquid hydrogen, which not only has a high calorific value but also provides essential cooling for engine and aircraft components.

World aviation science and technology have now really arrived at the possibility of constructing such engines. At least specimens of the necessary heat-resistant materials exist, flights have been made in aircraft powered by liquid hydrogen, and the theory and methods of computer studies have been developed and supercomputers constructed for this purpose.

Work on the multiple power unit is being coordinated by the Baranov Central Aviation Engine Building Institute, and the chief design facility is the A.M. Lyulka Experimental Design Bureau.

I would like to note the most important feature of the design and construction of advanced aerospace technology: This work, although it involves enormous expenditure, is known to be profitable. Its profitability consists not only and not chiefly in the falling costs of space programs and air transportation. It is profitable because of the tremendous development in new materials technology, computer technology, automation, and so forth. A typical example of this is the American moon flight program. Conceived not as a commercial program but merely as a scientific and prestige program, it paid for itself twice over owing to the extensive use of its advanced technological achievements in ordinary terrestrial applications.

Here are just two examples of the potential use of future technologies.

For spaceplane engines the extensive production of the latest heat-resistant alloys and compound materials is necessary. The use of these materials in conventional aviation will make it possible to reduce the weight of engines and make them more economical. And all other engineering technology, for example in the automotive sphere, could acquire fundamentally new properties and a new appearance, and will differ from current technology just as the modern transistor differs from the valve radio of 50 years ago.

Liquid hydrogen, which is essential as a fuel in spaceplane engines, could, if produced industrially, be used as the ideal ecologically clean fuel in transport power plants and the power industry on the ground.

It has to be said that our country is now in the forefront of aerospace technology. Our theoretical developments and designs for spaceplanes are not inferior to foreign ones, and in some respects our scientific and technical groundwork is unique. Suffice it to recall the Tupolev Tu-155 aircraft with its liquid-hydrogen-powered engine, and our rocket engines.

What will a spaceplane offer the inhabitants of the earth? Those in possession of spaceplane technology will dominate the aerospace product markets of the 21st century. No wonder the United States, which has made the greatest progress in studying this problem, is not keen to cooperate with other countries. It is counting on a monopoly and on surpassing all its competitors by a wide margin. After all, it is already evident from the example of new materials that the program will result not just in the construction of a spaceplane, but also that these materials and technologies will find a use in machine tool manufacture, the automotive industry, shipbuilding, metallurgy, engine manufacture, and so forth.

The spaceplane itself will be a multipurpose system with unique potential. The fact that it can be reused to deliver various payloads into space with a short turnaround time will enable the flow of "earth to orbit" freight to increase while offering the possibility of converting some of the production capacity currently producing nonreusable delivery vehicles.

A spaceplane with an inspection module could be used to carry out on-the-spot inspection of space devices in order to monitor the fulfillment of international agreements. The experience we have gained in designing and testing the experimental Tu-155 aircraft powered by liquid hydrogen and liquefied natural gas demonstrates that the use of cryogenic fuel has potential. Initially this will be natural gas—a Tu-156 using this is already being built. Then, when cheaper methods of producing liquid hydrogen have been developed, this will in turn be brought into service in conventional aviation.

Thus the infrastructure for producing, storing, and fueling up with liquid hydrogen will be created at many airfields. A fleet of spaceplanes could then be based at this network of airfields.

A spaceplane construction program is expensive and lengthy, and therefore a rejection of a confrontational approach and a rational international distribution of labor would allow countries to reduce their expenditure by cutting down on parallel and duplicate work, and would also speed up the manufacture of the efficient new types of technology that everyone on earth needs.

Needless to say, the spaceplane could also be used to tackle various military tasks, which is why this work was formerly top secret. But here we need a rational approach. We are not going to disclose our technological achievements, but the people should know what their money is being spent on. All the more so as the fact that research is being done into this problem is not particularly secret—all the advanced powers are working in this field.

Space Official Interviewed on Projects

LD1607154791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Excerpts] Cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev have spent six hours outside the Mir orbital complex and carried out a complicated assembly; they fixed a mounting platform on the outer surface of the station, which is to start a new complicated structure. Our observer Leonid Lazarevich interviewed Vladimir Aleksandrovich Shatalov, head of the Gagarin center for training cosmonauts.

[Begin recording] [Lazarevich] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, there are rumors among journalists, which have not yet been officially confirmed, that changes are to take place in the next expedition. It was originally planned that the crew of two cosmonauts, together with an Austrian citizen, is to go into space for a long time. They say that now the head of the crew is to fly... a cosmonaut representing Kazakhstan is to fly and an Austrian cosmonaut, and that Krikalev is to stay and continue his work as a part of the next expedition [sentence as heard]

[Shatalov] We are constantly examining the progress in implementing our space program. We must—it is also our duty—introduce certain corrections in connection with financial restrictions. [passage omitted] Originally two flights were planned. At present, after considering our options and examining thoroughly the program which is to be implemented during the flight with Austrian cosmonauts, and the program which is proposed by Kazakh scientists, we came to the conclusion that probably it is possible and expedient in principle to combine them. They will not harm each other, but will save a significant sum of money for our space activities, and will make it possible to save one more craft and a carrier-rocket to continue the work involving the Mir orbital complex next year.

We are currently studying and working through details of such an option. It is important that neither of this programs suffers. It is important to ensure safety and to secure the implementation of this program at all stages of the flight, and it is important that the work at the station continues at its present pace.

We will probably have to reconsider the composition of the crews, and most probably Krikalev will have to continue his work at the station until the arrival of the next main expedition. These issues have been coordinated with him.

As for implementation of further work on board the orbital complex under the new head of the crew—Volkov, who is to join the station, we have no particular worries and doubts here. Especially since they have already worked together, they have some experience and I think they will be glad to work together for some time on board the orbital complex. Presently this program... its details are being thoroughly examined at all levels. [end recording]

The crew will carry out the next space walk 19 July.

Crimean Solar Energy Institute Boasts Progress

OW1607013091 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 10 Jul 91

[G. Bulanov video report; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] The Krzhizhanovskiy Power Engineering Institute Experimental Base is situated on the southern coast of the Crimea. The group of specialists working there, are occupied in developing various methods of converting solar energy. So, how interesting is that? Judge our correspondent's report for yourselves. [Video shows a pyramid shaped building with solar panel sides, a parabolic solar energy collector, buildings, then cuts to an interior to show a console and an operator at a wall control panel]

[Begin recording] [Bulanov] How unusual, even fabulous, this base looks. The sun first went to work here four years ago, which incidentally, the Central Television morning program related at the time. The results achieved over this period raise hopes that we are, at last, on the threshold of the effective use of everlasting, ecologically clean, and safe sources of energy. For example, the efficiency factor of solar energy converters is approaching the levels of thermal electric power stations. There is a sufficiently wide range of equipment available for practical application. Even for a dacha there is this type of shower which gives 120 liters of hot water per hour. [Video shows a solar panel equipped outdoor shower cubicle, then cuts to show Bulanov interviewing V.K. Rybalko, chief of the base]

[Rybalko] We basically use solar energy for heating and cooling needs. As well as heat pumps, both (?complex) and absorption heat pumps. And also....

[Bulanov, interrupting] How are we to understand that?

[Rybalko] These are machines for producing cold in summer, for conditioning of air in premises, and in winter producing warmth for heating. Here, with the participation of the leading Institute's specialists, equipment for the direct conversion of solar energy into electricity is being used. And similarly, solar energy is used to obtain oxygen and hydrogen.

[Bulanov] Well, here you are working on the southern coast of the Crimea. Does the fact that this is a resort, and not only just the southern sun, influence your work schedule?

[Rybalko] Yes, for example, with the participation of other organizations, we have developed an interesting heliotherapeutic installation, with the aid of which we can treat people using solar energy. We have treated such diseases as osteochondrosis, radiculitis, rhinitis, in 3,000 patients in each category, and seem to have achieved positive results. We made several installations turnkey projects, with our own efforts and it involved development, planning, introduction, and adjustment. We collaborate with many organizations, including international organizations. [Video shows machinery room, a large parabolic solar energy collector] More so now that solar energy has begun to compete with thermal energy, after the increase in the cost of fuel. Therefore, we are now competitive. [end recording]

Military

Southern, Central Groups of Forces Abolished

LD1707133591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The defense minister has issued order number 308 which says that the Southern and the Central Groups of Forces have been abolished as of 1 July this year. Just to remind you that in accordance with the intergovernmental agreements, the withdrawal of our troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia has been completed.

Details of Lost MiG-23 Reported; Pilot Killed

PM1707195591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Colonel Ye. Zheldak, deputy chief of USSR Integrated State Aviation Search and Rescue Service under "We Report the Details" rubric: "On the MiG-23 Accident"]

[Text] On 15 July, the USSR Integrated State Aviation Search and Rescue Service command post received information on the disappearance of the radar signal from an aircraft of the Air Defense Forces aviation in the region of Nizhniy Tagil.

It has been established that the MiG-23 fighter, piloted by Military Pilot First Class Captain A. Khokhlov, took off from an airfield at 1735 hours and set course for a zone where the pilot was to carry out a training task. At 1756 hours contact with the aircraft was lost.

A regular [shtatnyy] Search and Rescue Service An-12 aircraft, and an alert-duty Mi-8 helicopter searched for the fighter 15 July. The search produced no results on that day. On 16 July, the search was joined by another An-12 aircraft, three Mi-8 helicopters, and two ground search-and-resecue teams. At 1750 hours the crew of one of the helicopters spotted aircraft wreckage in the taiga 65 km from Nizhniy Tagil. An inspection revealed that the fighter had broken up on impact with trees. The pilot perished. The "black box" has been found. The cause of the crash is being investigated by a special commission.

Several Military, Navy Departments To Disband

LD1707201291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Beginning 1 September, students will not receive military training under the reserve officers programs in a number of the country's higher educational establishments. Military and navy departments will be disbanded in some higher educational establishments of Moldova, the Baltic republics, Armenia, and Georgia by 1 November. Released officers will join the USSR Armed Forces, as well as main and central administrations of the USSR Defense Ministry.

Military Farms Shown Supplying Naval Vessels

PM1607095391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0740 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the documentary "The Army and Agriculture"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [video begins with shot of berthed submarine]

[Reporter] On long voyages to carry out combat standby duty—be they on land or at sea—the mood, morale, and combat capability of the men largely depends on their food. [video shows warships in harbor] Military sovkhozes have been organized specifically to supply fully the Armed Forces with food. As you have seen, they are successfully tackling this problem. [passage omitted]

Moiseyev Contacts Baltics on Solving Problems

LD1707233291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1915 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has received a telegram from the chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces, Army General Moiseyev, to Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius. It says:

In accordance with an agreement of the USSR and Lithuanian military experts, the USSR Ministry of Defense has issued instructions to the commanders of the Baltic Military District and the Baltic Navy to organize joint commissions with the republican and local government bodies in the military garrisons situated on the territories of the Baltic republics in order to solve problems of social and everyday provisions for the servicemen and members of their families and avoid conflicts linked with illegal actions. I ask you to issue corresponding instructions to the republican and local government organs to set up joint commisions and organize their work.

Similar telegrams have been sent to the Latvian and Estonian leaders.

Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius today sent a telegram to the chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces informing him that an instruction has been issued to Minister Abisala and the general director of the country's defense department, Audrius Butkevicius, and the local government heads to take corresponding measures to set up joint commissions with the commanders of the Baltic Military District and the Baltic Navy to avoid conflicts. The conviction is expressed that this will help to solve relations between the USSR and the Republic of Lithuania.

Time will tell whether Gen. Moiseyev's telegram really expresses the wish of the leadership of the USSR Armed Forces to begin solving the relations with the governments of the Baltic states in a civilized manner. It is obvious that this is essential. At the beginning it is necessary not to create new conflicts, which bring only unhappiness, suffering, and [word indistinct] notes ELTA.

Estonia

Savisaar Discusses 'Worsening Situation'

OW1807051191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Tuesday the Estonian Prime-Minister Edgar Savisaar met in Tallinn the mayors of Narva and Kohtla-Jarve Vladimir Chuikin and Vladimir Tsinev to discuss the worsening situation in the north-east of the republic. The city council of Narva decided to close the customs check-point in the town earlier this month. The government gave instructions to set up a temporary checkpoint outside the town on the 19th kilometer of the Narva-Tallinn highway.

The press secretary of the Estonian Government Juhan Hindov told BF [BALTFAX] that the Tuesday meeting did not produce any favourable results. The premier insisted on reopening the checkpoint in Narva.

"We cannot give up our policy of closing the border which would result in lower food prices here after price controls are lifted," Hindov said.

Chuikin promised the government to submit proposals from the Narva city authorities for resolving the problem.

The proposals will be discussed by the government next Monday. Chuikin also invited Edgar Savisaar to Narva where the city council will hold its next session on July 23.

The city council of Kohtla-Jarve is holding its session on Wednesday. According to observers, it might pass even tougher decisions than the city councils of Narva and Sillamae.

Meanwhile, the confrontation continues between customs officials and members of so-called workers' voluntary groups at the mobile checkpoint on the highway.

BF was informed by the Estonian border department that customs services are actually paralyzed because when attempts are made to stop and check passing vehicles the volunteers interfere.

Customs officials have been ordered to stop work if they are threatened with violence. There are also policemen at the checkpoint.

Highway Customs Post Removed

LD1707165591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1713 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Narva, 16 Jul (TASS)—A mobile customs post that was inspecting personal and state vehicles yesterday was today removed from the Tallinn-Leningrad highway.

In Tallinn, the Estonian leadership embarked on a dialogue with representatives of "recalcitrant Narva," which did not want control functions to be carried out on its territory, and, by a decision of its town soviet, abolished the customs post on the Friendship Bridge.

Narva's decision was also supported by deputies in the neighboring town of Sillamae. A session of the local town soviet decided to draw up and implement within three days a package of measures to curtail the activities of the customs posts and create conditions for normal life in the region. The session instructed the local prefecture of police to abide by the decision in its actions. If it is not carried out, the town soviet executive committee committed itself to suspending help to police personnel on tackling financial and social matters.

Sobchak Discusses Narva Free Economic Zone Issue

LD1707185691 Tallinn Estonian Television in Russian 1615 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Interview with Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak by unidentified correspondent at the "Bridges of Song" music festival in Tallinn on 7 July—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] This question has not so much to do with politics as it does with the economy: Have you been discussing the Narva issue? Is Leningrad ready to assist Narva in becoming a free economic zone in any way?

[Sobchak] A joint discussion on the Narva issue has not yet taken place, but we favor discussing the issue and then implementing the idea of a joint free economic zone. We favor, first, that Estonia's territorial unity is guaranteed and, second, that the issue of jointly using, say, Ivangorod and Narva as a free economic zone is discussed, where the right to a free economic zone is implemented, as provided to us now by both the Union and republican—Russian—governments. It would have a free customs regime, a hard currency regime, and a taxation regime, and it would provide an impetus toward this region's development. With joint development, this will only benefit Estonia and the Leningrad region. Today, I exchanged views with the republican leaders, and we have, in principle, agreed to continue these discussions and meetings to get to grips with resolving the matter in the way that the residents of both Narva and Ivangorod—and Estonia and Russia—would win. We are good neighbors, and we must resolve all issues in a goodneighbourly way, all of them. We must sit around a joint table and agree how best to live and work together.

Interregional Council Leader on United Estonia

LD1707182491 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Arnold Say, one of the leaders of the Interregional Council [Estonian deputies and working people] has given an interview to ETA.

Arnold Say said to an ETA correspondent that if the government continues to pursue its present policy, the council may have to resort to its own measures, until their own bodies of power and local government are set up. Arnold Say emphasized that the Council works using only parliamentary methods and that there is no plan to break any laws. Guidance will be taken from the USSR local government laws.

Touching upon plans to up set their own bodies of power Arnold Say noted that these could be set up first and foremost in northeast Estonia, in Paldiski, Loksa and perhaps in some Tallinn rayons; in all those areas where the majority supports noncapitalist development. According to him, however, this is not the favored idea. The Interregional Council wants to make a stand for a united Estonia which must definitely be a sovereign republic within the composition of the USSR. There is a categorical opposition to violence of any kind. For precisely this reason the Council Presidium proposed that all the unlawfully created bodies—as they called them—like Kodukaitse and kaitseliit are dispersed. Should this happen there is a readiness to disperse even workers squads.

According to Arnold Say the crisis at narva can only be resolved by applying the USSR local government law.

Latvia

Bomb Explodes at Riga Procuracy Building

LD1707213491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Russian 2030 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Report by Lyubov Chernaya]

[Summary] In Riga today at about 1300 there was an explosion in the procuracy builidng. An explosive device was placed in a lavatory on the third floor. A door was damaged during the explosion, windows were broken, and a wall of an office was damaged. an injured official had to be taken to the hospital. Experts believe this explosion differs from those that occured in Latvia last winter. An investigation is being carried out by the procuracy of the Republic of Latvia.

Internal Affairs Minister on Relations With USSR

LD1707175891 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0500 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] At the news conference hall of the Supreme Council of Latvia yesterday, journalists met Andrejs Krastins, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council; Juris Dobelis, deputy chairman of the parliament's Commission for Defense and Internal Affairs; and Minister of Internal Affairs Aloizs Vaznis.

They discussed the gradual change of the militia to a new status as the law on the police in Latvia comes into force. The duties and rights of the police will change, and reorganization of militia establishments will continue. Likewise, as soon as the parliament and the Supreme Council's presidium resume their work, proposals on uniforms, special service ranks, and distinguishing marks for police workers will be examined.

Vaznis said that he recently went to Germany and found out how, with the help of German firms, the material and technical base of the police in Latvia can be consolidated.

The journalists were interested in the recent incident between patrol service workers and the Special Purpose

Militia Detachment [OMON] combatants. Vaznis said two militia workers who had been collecting small-bore cartridges bought at the sports base of a production association were attacked by 12 men dressed in sports clothes and armed with submachine guns. They took both workers, together with their motor vehicles and cartridge boxes, to the OMON base at Vecmilgravis, where a representative of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic procuracy was present. The interrogation lasted for six hours, until one of the militiamen had to be given medical aid. The medical men who arrived demanded his immediate transfer to a hospital, because his life was in danger. The reply was: If he dies, we will write him off.

Here is how this incident was commented upon by Minister of Internal Affairs Aloizs Vaznis:

[Begin Vaznis recording] This is a regular type of provocation. From this I draw the conclusion that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is very interested in provoking some kind of an armed conflict with us, as attempts to do so are continuously repeated. There is no reaction on the part of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to put an end to such a conflict situation and such provocations. As I understand, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is interested in weakening our combat capabilities, in weakening our possibilities for combating crime, because—thanks to these actions and since we have had quite a lot of arms and ammunition robbed—all that is directed so we will not be able to carry out firing training and so that the potential of our armaments will be weakened.

How will we succeed in solving these questions? We are solving them, but should we not be able to solve them in the near future, then it cannot be excluded that we will be compelled to break off diplomatic relations with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and to change over to direct contacts with the ministries of internal affairs of the Union republics. [end recording]

Latvia To Replace Civil Defense Service

LD1707212791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The Latvian Internal Affairs Ministry is organizing a service to eliminate the consequences of accidents and elemental disasters. It is being called upon to replace the system of civil defense. It is proposed that a permanent duty service and an agency to tackle emergencies will be set up. Their tasks will include both conducting rescue work and providing medical treatment, as well as ensuring public order in emergency situations.

Lithuania

Statement Issued to Internal Affairs Officials

LD1707235191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1915 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The following is a statement by the government of the Republic of Lithuania to internal affairs officials:

The institutions of the internal affairs system of the Republic of Lithuania have been depoliticized. Its officials are being guided by the law and government decisions only. Calm must prevail in Lithuania. We must defend the lawful interests of people and the state. The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has been striving and will consistently strive so that political parties, public and political movements, or figures are not able to guide the activity of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in one or another direction, or violate the social stability of the state. In assessing the interior service or police officials, none other than the criteria of competence and respect for the individual and the law must be applied. The government will be able to ensure that the officials of police and interior services serving Lithuania are properly, lawfully defended, irrespective of their world outlook or convictions.

We urge the residents of Lithuania and, above all, all politicians, not to take steps that would draw the officials of the Ministry of Internal Affairs or of the country's defense department into the whirlpool of political passions, thus creating a threat to social calm and the creation of a law abiding state.

Landsbergis Comments on Internal Struggles

LD1707165691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] In Vytautas Landsbergis' opinion, people in Lithuania are still trying to replace the principal question of independence with that of power and then further exciting the situation by an internal struggle for power accompanied by justification for this.

In a LIETUVOS AIDAS article, Vytautas Landsbergis observes that something more than a historical optimism is prevalent in the West, since no one is questioning Lithuania's independence. "Within Lithuania itself," according to Vytautas Landsbergis, "an internal, forced and adventurist tension is being justified. A confusion of opinions and positions, slander and [word indistinct] is being created, so that the people are totally exhausted.

The author of the article concludes by noting that the contrast is huge, when one compares how solid and honorable Lithuania appears and how it is assessed throughout the world and how it appears if one were to believe the local newspaper mess.

Vytautas Landsbergis observes that the internal Lithuanian opposition is already working for future elections and while appealing for moderation, he asks: Is it not too early? Is this the right time? By what means are they endeavoring to create a parliamentary and governmental crisis?

Vilnius OMON Commander Interviewed

PM1807083191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Major of Militia B. Makutynovich, commander of the Vilnius OMON, by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak; date and place of interview not stated: "The OMON in Lithuania: 'We Cannot Go Against Our Conscience'"]

[Text] The OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] in Lithuania.... It so happens that public attention has centered on this small militia subunit under Union authority for several months now. Some of its actions have had political repercussions often reaching far beyond Lithuanian borders, and sometimes beyond the Union. Thus, the recent incident at the Vilnius telephone exchange evoked highly contradictory assessments. It stands to reason that you can only understand the whole complexity and drama of the conflict around the OMON with the help of thorough analysis of all the facts and events, taking into consideration various opinions and positions. It is clear that it is very important to know what the OMON members themselves are guided by and understand their logic. Our correspondent interviewed B. Makutynovich, commander of the detachment, with this aim.

"We received information," B. Makutynovich says, "that weapons and ammunition had been supplied to the intercity telephone exchange. We rechecked the report. It was confirmed. We went to the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor's Office. Twenty men arrived at the exchange and informed management representatives of their intention. The investigators together with their witnesses started to inspect the premises. The OMON did not switch off any intercity telephone communications, as newspapers reported; we do not even know how to do this. But the fact remains: A bag containing TNT cartridges, ammunition, and a homemade small-caliber pistol was found in one of the ventilator shafts."

[Gromak] Why has there been so much fuss about this operation?

[Makutynovich] As a result of law enforcement organs being placed under the authority of the local republic leadership there are now no institutions in Lithuania that can ensure the validity of USSR laws and protect the dignity of USSR citizens, and that includes protecting them from the arbitrariness of the so-called customs and border services. The Lithuanian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the police that is now being formed have not only lost the right to put an end to such activity but are getting drawn into it themselves. There is no point talking about the Lithuanian Republic Prosecutor's Office since from the first days of its existence it embarked on the path of ignoring Union legislation.

Therefore, strange as it may seem, at present, only the OMON, which is under the authority of the USSR MVD, and the Lithuanian SSR Prosecutor's Office are capable of ensuring at least to some extent the security of those who are continuing to see themselves as USSR citizens.

Our detachment is made up of 150 people. What can it do? What plans of aggression is it capable of nurturing? By slandering us, the gentlemen from parliament and their corrupt press are placing something else at stake here. This fuss is helping them to remain afloat.

[Gromak] Then let us talk facts. For example, how are we to assess the following report published in EKHO LITVY: "On Saturday at around 1300, OMON members carried out a raid on the Lithuanian customs post at Vilnius airport. This operation was led by Vilnius OMON Commander B. Makutynovich."

[Makutynovich] On 21 June practically all flights were disrupted at Vilnius airport since people were forced to go through Lithuanian customs as well as the obligatory pre-flight examination, and in addition, articles and produce were taken from them. People started approaching us, and citizens made telephone calls to the base complaining about tyranny. A decision was made to go there the next day, the Saturday, to see what was actually going on there.

We arrived and saw the customs post. I went inside with another two people. Inside there was a representative of the customs service of the territorial defense department. Note, a structure that the USSR president has deemed illegal. There is also a Union law on instituting criminal proceedings in cases of blocking roads and main routes, including air routes. I asked this customs man the question: What is going on here? He answered that he was carrying out an examination of the luggage of passengers leaving Vilnius airport for other cities in the country. I reminded him of the relevant Union norms and suggested that he put an end to the illegal action. He quickly gathered up his things and left. That, strictly speaking, was the whole "raid" on the customs house.

[Gromak] Then can you explain your actions and the actions of the detachment in other incidents at "customs posts" which the mass media have been reporting on practically every day..

[Makutynovich] If you believe the press, then overall, we have burned down around 50 customs posts here. This, I stress, is according to statements by people who are trying to create a particular image for us. When meeting representatives of the government and the Lithuanian MVD, I have repeatedly said that we are operating on the basis of the USSR laws and we will continue to operate only on their basis.

Relevant USSR legislation exists under which these customs posts are illegal. And we are closing them by legal means and methods. As for burning things down, of which we have been accused, then I state unequivocally: We have not burned anything down. The last instance of closing a customs post was in the Zarasai area on the border with Latvia. Having preliminary information at our disposal, our group left for this customs post and disarmed the people there. They confiscated a carbine, live cartridges for it, a radio set, and special equipment. They closed the customs post and left.

And I also know who burned it down. Whole groups of people have recently appeared in Lithuania who are disguised in OMON and paratroop uniform. We ourselves saw this, and there are ample irrefutable cases of these people faking OMON raids on schools with the aim of seizing the pupils... for the ranks of the Soviet Army.

And the last case. The "Palanga" restaurant rang up and informed us that a man in OMON uniform was kicking up a row there. The patrol detail detained the man. When we checked, we found out that he was a representative of the Territorial Defense Department (the so-called DOK) disguised in our uniform. We called his wife, who brought some clothes, and the 'DOK' member" was released, minus his OMON uniform. This was all filmed on video.

During the latest incident of the "seizure" of a customs post by us, I met with the Lithuanian MVD leadership. These former colleagues read a report in the press and immediately sent a telegram on the "burning down" to Union minister Pugo. I asked them: Why did you sign it? The answer was: It has been established that it was the OMON. Excuse me, established by whom? Silence....

Under pressure from concrete facts, the Lithuanian MVD leaders were obliged to admit that they had made a blunder: They believed trashy rumors and not specific information.

[Gromak] Incidentally, Boleslav, what are your relations with the leadership of the Lithuanian MVD like?

[Makutynovich] There is a big problem with the Lithuanian militia, because a republic law on the police has been adopted. People have to go against their conscience, their nature, and take another oath....

Landsbergis recently stated: We have won two main victories—today the prosecutor's office is ours and today the MVD has been made subordinate to us. You can agree with him, since any state system is based on these pillars. But the actions of the new structures do not agree with USSR laws, and we are opposed to this.

Of course, it is sad that killings are being carried out in Lithuania, and there is an arms trade, and the republic government has practically excommunicated us from the work being carried out in the fight against crime. We have been forced to form an operations section (I will not hide this) which will be involved in operations work and intelligence. We are receiving clear information about both the movement and the storage in Lithuania of a large number of firearms. We have been to markets where weapons are sold, and specific individuals.

I proposed to the leadership of the Lithuanian MVD: Let us carry out a joint operation to confiscate them. They agreed. But when I presented them with the concrete facts and it became clear that the weapons were being delivered for the DOK, the discussion on cooperation ended immediately. Apparently the DOK is a legal structure. What do they mean, legal? After all, these people are criminals. This is reaching the point of absurdity. Unconcealed arms trading is going on in the parliament building—the palace where the law is formed.

[Gromak] At the end of May the Lithuanian Parliament adopted a resolution "On the USSR MVD OMON and other USSR Formations and Their Actions Against the Lithuanian Republic and its Population." You are being called criminals against whom criminal proceedings will be instituted.

The Lithuanian Republic Prosecutor's Office recently instituted criminal proceedings against Captain of Militia Roshchin, and a warrant has been issued for his arrest. How is the detachment receiving all this?

[Makutynovich] We are fully staffed. At the moment 135 people have been registered on my orders, and 40 are going through a probationary period as candidates. And looking into the future, we have another 150 applications. People are coming to us, despite everything. And the resolution that you mentioned was meant to sow panic in our ranks. After all, we were even given a week to think about it....

[Gromak] Did anyone leave the detachment after this?

[Makutynovich] Of course people left. Mikonis left. An outstanding guy. A wonderful militiaman. But in this situation of unconcealed terror that has formed around the detachment, it is particularly difficult for the Lithuanians. We have been accused of being traitors, Judases, condemned men, gallows birds. Many threats have been made against our families. And Mikonis had many relatives who worked for Sajudis. And they placed him in a tough situation: Either you leave the OMON or we disown you.

The average age of our militiamen is 25. The officers are older. Our earnings are les than those of the Lithuanian police, and we have no social guarantees. But I repeat, people are coming to us. Because they understand that you cannot live like this. If we are all silent and sit in our corner, things will reach the point of bloodshed. We have to shout about this far and wide or it will be too late.

As for the mood in the detachment, I state unequivocally: People cannot suffer endlessly. Landsbergis the musician knows that if you constantly tighten a string, it may break. That is why all the officers spend their days and nights in the subunit. We are monitoring the situation. And we are lowering psychological tension by means of sport, physical exertion, and various pursuits.

The personnel is keen to do the work which we have been excluded from. In Lithuania 75 percent of crimes have not been brought to light to date. And a detachment which is at full strength and is trained and equipped has been prevented from working. Is this not a paradox? You mentioned Roshchin. Yes, he and 40 militiamen came into the detachment bringing their weapons with them. And the Lithuanian Republic Prosecutor's Office instituted criminal proceedings on the basis of theft of weapons. I said to them: Gentlemen, do not touch this man, this is going too far. We will not leave him in the lurch, because he has not committed any crime. The MVD structure is a Union structure. The Lithuanian MVD weapons have been obtained from the Union. Roshchin handed these weapons over to the OMON—a Union structure. He did not use force. How is he to blame?

[Gromak] And the last question, Boleslav. In connection with the operation at the telephone exchange you were called to Moscow. And, as was made known through the press, Major General of Militia Kalachev, chief of the Main Administration for the Protection of Public Order, said that your actions at the telephone exchange were unsanctioned and that the strictest measures would be taken against you. How do you assess this?

[Makutynovich] I told General Kalachev that I did not violate the law. I carried out the well-known USSR Presidential Decree on the Confiscation of Weapons and Ammunition as my conscience and duty dictated. Next to me was the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] prosecutor, and he did not detect any contradictory actions in the work of the detachments....

Aims of Lithuanian Opposition Forum Outlined

PM1707122591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report on interview with Gediminas Kirkilas, activist of the Forum for the Future of Lithuania and deputy chairman of the Democratic Labor Party, by correspondent N. Lashkevich under the "Political Map" rubric; date, place not given; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction: "Lithuania: What is the Opposition Striving For?"]

[Text] What is the nature of political dissidence in Lithuania? What is the essence of the disagreements between the new moderates and the official position of the Lithuanian leadership? Nikolay Lashkevich, our correspondent in Lithuania, asked one of the activists of the FFL [Forum for the Future of Lithuania]—Gediminas Kirkilas, deputy [as published] of the Democratic Labor Party—to speak about the opposition movement.

[Kirkilas] The political life of Lithuania remains complex, tense, and dynamic. As is well known, at the time of the 9 February general poll the republic's inhabitants almost unequivocally advocated a democratic and independent Lithuanian state. And you could not find any serious political forces in Lithuania today that would oppose this. Even the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) campaigns for democracy and sovereignty. True, it emphasizes at the same time—as part of the USSR.

And yet, despite the clear strategic course, Lithuanian society has become politically differentiated. Within it different views are taken of the paths leading to independence. Problems of a political nature are complicated by the economic crisis and the exacerbation of social problems, which are continuing to deepen in Lithuania. This crisis is undoubtedly rooted in objective causes—the overall crisis of the economy of "developed socialism in the USSR." We were and still are firmly tied to its economy. However, there are, in my opinion, subjective reasons, too: the new bureaucracy's reluctance to part with power in favor of economic freedom and the levying of excessive taxes on business executives. At the same time this process stems from the false premise that such a policy will more quickly destroy the old economic structures and promote the emergence of new ones. The realization of these views today is clearly impeding the transition to a normal economy. Everyone advocates the market, verbally at any rate, but how is the transition to it to be made? Inexperience, the urge to administer, and the desire to seize as much as possible of the privatization pie act as hindrances. All this is mingled with the obvious motives of social revenge and with political and ideological prejudices—in short, serious disagreements exist in society over questions of the tactics for acquiring real independence.

The appearance of the FFL at the forefront of big league politics appears logical against this sociopolitical background. What is this forum? It is not easy to explain the reasons for the emergence of a new political alliance. Still less its political variety: It includes former leaders of "Sajudis," Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputies, ex-Premier K. Prunskiene, the farmers' union, the confederation of free trade unions, the Democratic Labor Party, the journalists union, and representatives of the social democrats, the creative and scientific intelligentsia, national minorities, industrialists, economists, and former political prisoners and exiles. What unites these people who generally hold different political convictions? Above all, concern for Lithuania's future and, still more, for their region's present. Although everyone seems to be concerned about this, I am convinced that the people of Lithuania are far from indifferent to what the road to such cherished independence will be like.

We favor a moderate approach to the development of sovereignty based on common sense and pragmatism. We find unacceptable both the path of right-wing radicals (the Independence Party, the democrats, the Lithuanian Freedom League, partly the present "Sajudis," and others), who seek to arrive at independence regardless of the real cost and the geographic location, and the choice of left-wing radicals, who are inclined to an orthodox solution of the Lithuanian problem ("only as part of the USSR," "Soviet Socialist Lithuania," etc.). As always, extremes are not capable of resolving the problem by political means. Hence the need for centrist or moderate forces. Of course, this is just the beginning. Positions might change in the course of the political struggle, as well as the correlation and place in the political spectrum. This whole distribution is rather conditional and, to a certain extent, simplistic. However, it is necessary to try to define the forum's role and place, at least at the present stage.

The FFL conference, held in Vilnius in April, ratified the basic provisions of the FFL's moderate forces and the confederation's manifesto and elected the secretariat and the coalition council, which unites the aforementioned political and public forces, organizations, and movements. Incidentally, many well known people in Lithuania were elected to the council: the writer V. Petkevicius, the poet A. Maldonis, the philosophers B. Genzialis, A. Lozuraitis, J. Karosas, and K. Stoskus, the economists K. Prunskiene, P. Gilis, K. Antanavicius, J. Veselka, and K. Jaskelavicius, and the priest M. Dobrovolskis—31 people in all.

The forum sees itself as a component of the opposition in Lithuania. Opposition to the unrealistic, ritual policy for achieving our people's main aims: the restoration of independent statehood and the assertion of democracy and a market economy. With what else does the opposition disagree? I will cite the words of one of the initiators and creators of the opposition bloc—the philosopher A. Juozaitis, formerly one of the leaders of "Sajudis:" "The forum must implement a consistent policy, not a declarative one. Previously, before 9 February, people spoke of opposition as a provocation. With our idolatrous consciousness, it struck us as unnecessary. What was happening hitherto was not democracy but gossip. An opposition is needed now, as the vacuum between the authorities and society is growing."

Of course, not only an opposition is needed, although it is the undoubted and most visible element of any democracy. Dissidence must find an outlet in organized opposition structures. This is understandable. But a civil society which expresses its attitude to power through its organizations and, maybe, primarily through the FFL as an alliance of these organizations and, if you like, limits this power also assumes part of the responsibility and initiative. Relations between the authorities and a civil society are one of the most complex problems of the development of political culture and democracy throughout East Europe.

"We are all first-graders with regard to democratic policy," the final line in the FFL manifesto states, "and must help one another." Therefore the basic provisions of the FFL enshrine parameters of activity concerning policy, culture, and the economy and aimed at strengthening the influence of civil society. Parliament, the government, and the state as a whole must serve this society and not vice versa, as is happening, alas, in Lithuania at present. The program aims of "Sajudis" (the election victory was won under its flag) must be realized at last—the aims of separating powers, establishing a constitutional court, recalling deputies, etc. It is in precisely this case that we can speak of true people's power and not of the supremacy of individual groups of politicians.

Sad though it may be, at present we still rely on the authorities (the master will come along...) and not on the self-managing people. And so the authorities, despite the fact that they include both new people and the old bureaucracy, react in a very pained and earnest way to any independence and to attempts to limit their interference in the economy, for example. There are attempts to return to the administrative-edict system of managing the economy with state orders, to use dictatorial methods to remove unwelcome leaders, etc. The forum believes that the economy cannot be developed by administrative means and that purposeful privatization is needed together with a possible system of social guarantees. On the whole, the line of the forum's economic policy is social-reformist, directing the economic reform onto the evolutionary path of changing economic relations.

The opposition advocates the priority development of culture, science, and education and the assertion of national and panhuman values in society. The forum does not approve of the wave of new nihilism, of the denial of everything that has been created, and advocates openness of culture and concord among the various national cultures of Lithuania.

Unfortunately, the opposition movement in Lithuania was given a hostile reception. Several provocative explosions rang out at FFL events. Right-wingers at once mounted very sharp criticism, frequently overstepping the bounds of civilized polemics, and thereupon tried in a purely Bolshevist spirit to stigmatize the participants in the conference at which the forum took shape organizationally. However, the FFL has made itself heard, as it were, in Lithuania. The creation of rayon components has begun. People are interested in its ideas. To the amazement of critics, FFL rayon and city conferences play to packed houses. In short, the opposition is gaining in political weight....

One of the most complex problems over which there is currently a very acute polemic is relations with the Soviet Union. Even before the forum was created, on the eve of the elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet last year, this problem had become the basis of the political platforms of the main rival forces—"Sajudis" and the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. At that time the concept of A. Brazauskas' party, to which the press gave the name "step by step," did not receive the support of the majority of voters. They disagreed with the successive, phased introduction of independence. And this determined the steep tilt toward the West in the policy of the victorious majority. However, a great deal is seen differently now, and the "step by step" policy is gaining ever-greater support. Now even the West supports a more considered and rational policy in respect of the eastern neighbor.

I believe that the FFL is, after the Democratic Labor Party, one of the few political forces to have specific strategic and tactical approaches to resolving problems of the relationship between Lithuania and the USSR. On 15 May the newspaper TIESA published the "principles of the strategy of political and economic relations with the USSR." Their essence is that it is necessary to widely discuss and propose to Moscow the start of talks on temporary cooperation (for three to five years) between Lithuania and the USSR. They take account of the military, strategic, economic, and national interests of the USSR and Lithuania, and the approaches to resolving this problem change accordingly. Of course, these are proposals from just one of the political forces in the republic, and they do not prevail in official policy. However, these ideas are gradually receiving ever greater public support, and I do not rule out the likelihood that they could hold sway.

Lithuania, while being independent, will not change its geographic location. It was, is, and will be the neighbor of Russia, Belorussia, Latvia, and Poland. All are interested in good-neighborliness, regardless of political passions. Particularly as there have been not only black pages in the history of the peoples of Lithuania and Russia, and Lithuania's independence is not insulting to Russia or the USSR as a whole. Nowadays all questions, even the most difficult ones, are resolved around the negotiating table. This is what Europe does, and it is what the whole civilized world does. By setting aside grudges and ambitions, we will more quickly heal the historical wounds which, I hope, will not seem so significant to our more fortunate descendants. As far as it is able and, of course, using constitutional means of political struggle, the FFL will promote the development of a new relationship with the Soviet Union and of a new independent and democratic Lithuania.

Congress Adjourns Without Electing Chairman

OW1807054991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of Russia has decided to interrupt its work till autumn. It failed to elect the chairman of the Russian parliament to replace Boris Yeltsin Russian president last month.

Even after several rounds of voting neither Ruslan Khasbulatov, nor Sergey Baburin—the two main candidates—managed to collect the necessary number of votes to win: 531.

Khasbulatov who chaired the Wednesday session urged the deputies to vote for postponing the elections till autumn. The proposal was backed by 825 deputies, with 74 voting against and 33 abstaining.

The congress decided without voting to make first deputy chairman of the parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov acting chairman till the elections.

Baburin, Khasbulatov View Problems

LD1707230191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent I. Minayev] It was clear and evident today from everything going on in the auditorium and lobbies that many of the deputies had markedly reduced interest in the events taking place at the [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies. What had happened? Was it normal parliamentary work where, as we know, anything is possible and here the absence of a result is in essence also a result, or was it a parliamentary crisis and a parliamentary deadlock which put in grave doubt the effectiveness of the congress itself as an institution of legislative power?

[Baburin] For the time being we have halted halfway. I regret that we have halted. For that reason I have just been trying to propose a way out of the crisis. I said that I would do everything possible to convince my supporters not to vote for me, because my view is that one of us ought to be the loser and that democracy should triumph. Unfortunately, however, the congress is tired. We have been working at a time when in principle no parliament in the world operates, that is, at the time of the summer vacation and agricultural work, in respect of which there are very many problems including for the majority of deputies.

[Minayev] It is being said that the congress has reached a deadlock because there is confrontation between two forces—democrats and communists.

[Baburin] I think that there has been a confrontation, but it has not been a confrontation between democrats and communists. It has been between the radicals and the moderate reformers.

[Khasbulatov] The deadlock has not come about through the imperfection of the political institutions but as a consequence of the fact that there has been a fight here between two lines—the reform and antireform lines. That really is all. There has here been, as you know, a faltering on the part of so-called democrats and a breach was formed, which was immediately used by what I regard as fairly reactionary forces. But I see no purpose in making too much of a tragedy of this and it would be inappropraite. The Supreme Soviet will indeed function and it has shown its capability.

[Minayev] It is a thankless thing to go in for forecasts. Who would have thought that this congress would have had such a scenario? Nevertheless, when it continues in the fall, how in your view will events develop?

[Khasbulatov] It is difficult to say. Our congress is unpredictable. So let us wait until the fall. Most probably it will be held at the end of October or start of November. That is what I am planning to do.

Commentary on Adjournment

LD1707141391 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 17 Jul 91

[by World Service analyst Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow July 17 TASS—The Fifth Special Russian Congress of People's Deputies began on July 10 with the colourful inauguration of Boris Yeltsin as Russia's first popularly elected president, a triumph for the democrats who had fought hard for the introduction of an executive style presidency in the largest Soviet republic at previous sessions of its expanded legislature.

The congress adjourned until autumn today after seven days of bickering and six ballots that failed to find a replacement for Boris Yeltsin as chairman of the Russian Parliament.

Neither first deputy parliament chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov, nominated by the democrats, nor Sergei Baburin, supported by the communists of Russia bloc, were able to win the necessary majority.

However, the deadlock differed from the impasse in which deputies found themselves last year when they were strugglling to elect Boris Yeltsin to the post of Russian parliament chairman. This time, the deadlock was not so much the result of a split between radicals and communists, but of a "revolt" in the democratic camp.

From the start, democrats were unable to agree on a single candidate, fielding three in the first round, while the Russian leadership clearly pitched for Khasbulatov.

More than 100 radical democrats staunchly refused to support Khasbulatov, depriving him of victory. The reason for the stand-off, analysts believe, is Khasbulatov himself, a skillful, but tough leader who often offended the most fiery of democrats, prompting accusations of authoritarian methods.

His nationality—he is a Chechen from the northern Caucasus—is also a cause for resentment among some, as well as the fact that he often agreed to compromises with communists in complex situations.

In fact, the bulk of democrats, who have been Boris Yeltsin's main powerbase, this time refused to support his "man". The "disobedience" signalled a split in the democratic camp. The first signs appeared soon after the signing of the "Nine Plus One" agreement between the nine Soviet republics and President Mikhail Gorbachev, when the radical wing of the democratic Russia movement accused Yeltsin of giving in to Gorbachev.

Now, after Yeltsin's landslide in the presidential election, the disarray in the amorphous opposition movement is worsening due to differences between member parties.

Summing up the forum's results, it is worth remembering the festive opening ceremony during which Gorbachev welcomed newly elected Russian president Boris Yeltsin.

The audience met the Soviet president with tumultuous applause, signalling a considerable improvement in relations between Russia and the central authorities. The mood sharply contrasted with that during the third congress in March when deputies threatened a walk-out unless the Soviet government removed troops from central Moscow.

The troops were deployed to block massive demonstrations organised by the democrats.

Yeltsin's Priority Political Tasks Listed

PM1707115791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 91 p 1

[Article by B. Pugachev under the rubric "Prognosis": "No More Than Nine Months in Reserve"]

[Text] And so Yeltsin is Russia's first president. How is he going to rule the country? You have to search for the answer to this question in the president's personality traits and in Russia's political realities, where his character is going to come through.

Yeltsin is a man of power. All his life has been devoted to the struggle for power, and this has decisively affected the present Russian leader's overall cast of mind. Problems of power will be Yeltsin's first problems as a president, who has been invested with the widest powers by the highest Russian law and who has been elected by the people. In the final analysis, the fierce struggle between the center and the republics is a struggle for the right to implement power through the people in the republics themselves. Yeltsin has received this right and personally embodies this right. And in this respect Yeltsin's traits as a politician and Russia's needs coincide.

Yeltsin's second task relating to power is to reform the administrative structures of the "second" order. Stabilization of power in Russia itself is impossible without demolishing the resistance of the wilful nomenklatura at local level.

In the immediate future we should expect the appointment of representatives of Russia's president in the provinces with the purpose of creating a system of executive power controlled from bottom up. Most of the citizens' distrust in the whole of the power structure is towards the leadership in the provinces. The overwhelming majority of inhabitants (73.5 percent) do not see themselves having the chance to influence the resolution of their own problems where they live.

The RSRSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President's third priority task (not by its significance but its place on the list) which relates to power is to halt the country's economic and social collapse. Yeltsin has been given no more than six to nine months initially to resolve this. If in this period real reforms are not set in motion in Russia, Yeltsin risks getting into the same situation as Gorbachev. The complication of solving this task is connected with the necessity to carry out reforms both in Russia and the Union as a whole at the same time. In the event of the center's disrupting these reforms, Yeltsin will, in our view, go ahead and conclude economic agreements with the republics without the center's participation.

The resolution of the three cited tasks relating to power will require Russia's entire administrative system to be reformed. It is inevitable that the executive power system will be strengthened with the work of the representative organs being more clear-cut. This inclination to strengthen the executive power manifested itself in the desire (71.5 percent of those questioned) for the election of the Russian president by the whole people. At the central level, it is enshrineed today in the hope (76.7 percent) for the election of the USSR president too by the whole people.

It seems that this will be a leitmotiv for administrative reform in Russia, which, it is possible, Yeltsin will propose once he has put forward his own conception of a "presidential" Constitution for the republic.

Of course, a lot will depend on Yeltsin as a personality. He has undoubtedly displayed his will and bravery in pitting himself against the one-party system. It is obvious that Yeltsin will not as president be hostage to parliament's moods. And problems will unavoidably arise here. Clashes with parliament and the various tendencies within it are possible. The legal basis for resolving them is the RSFSR Constitution. But a mutual psychological understanding of the new situation is also important.

Parliament, in accepting the position of the division of powers, should appreciate in a new way the new potential and the new means for the Russian head of executive power to act. Yeltsin faces the same task as president. Namely: to govern fairly while respecting all the legislature's prerogatives. This places a great moral responsibility on Yeltsin. His personal task is to display his own best qualities without allowing them to mutate into their antitheses. No way should political boldness develop into political adventurism. A politician's strong will is not there to push people into adventurist methods of administration. Transient fads and rash improvisations cannot be substituted for great political intuition. The native wit of a politician of that importance is continually in need of enrichment by broadening his knowledge and education.

Stern ordeals await Russia. The choice has been made. And the most important thing for Yeltsin and all of us is to be worthy of this choice.

P.S. When preparing this item, material from a sociological poll, carried out under the supervision of Doctor of Historical Sciences V.A. Yatskiy in Russia's regions, was used by permission of the leadership of the Institute of Social and Political Technologies attached to the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

Polozkov, Other Deputies on State Structure

PM1707094791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 91 p 1

["Interviews With People's Deputies in the Corridors Around the Congress" by Inna Muravyeva; date not given: "The Federation: Preserving Russia Within Its Borders"]

[Text] Aleksey Kazannik:

I believe that the main thing right now is to preserve Russia within its present borders. It must essentially be a question of creating a federation on treaty-based principles in Russia. In raising autonomous entities' status to the level of republics we are provoking an agglomeration of different law and order systems and different sovereignties, which makes the entire structure unstable.

But if, for example, we preserve the autonomous entities' status by concluding a treaty on how to distribute powers, everything will fall into place. The distribution of powers between the Russian Federation as a whole and the components of the Russian Federation would also mean that within the Russian Federation the components of the federation would be sovereign within the limits of their powers and that the Russian Federation as a whole would not have the right to intrude on the powers of the components of the federation, just as the components of the federation would not have the right to exercise Russia's powers.

When everyone legislates within the limits of their powers there will be no "war of laws."

I am profoundly convinced that the "war of laws" was provoked from above. The Russian Federation sought to formulate a more or less acceptable draft Union Treaty. For a long time, and quite correctly, the Russian leadership would not sign those rough sketches and initial options. The center began a very dangerous game, but then came to realize itself that it had gone too far, that it is difficult to get these processes under control.

Ivan Polozkov:

On the subject of the erstwhile autonomous entities. I am an optimist: There is no republic today, even a union republic, that can survive without the Union. That's the way we built our economy. And not only after 1917, but from the beginning of the century, that is, when Russia's borders were what they were at that time.... You know that its borders were farther-flung than they are today. In general terms that's the way we are. And today it's absurd to talking about breaking away without a treaty, without taking account of the realities. So Tatarstan's going to quit Russia? Where will it go? They are totally intertwined. OK, they're going to leave; OK, they're going to declare.... Even so they should sit down at the negotiating table with the Russian Government and try to decide where they are going to sell their output, how they are going to transport it, how people are going to get there, where they'll be able to fly to.... Whatever happens this republic is going to be inside Russia. It can't go anywhere else.

Erdem Tsybikzhapov:

We know that nature is integrated. In every part of the world there are specific plants and trees that can live only in that microclimate, and that's the approach we should take to autonomous entities. Because culture, like trees, takes centuries to develop. The human race which has lived in this area, this microclimate, this sphere which it has created over the centuries, is the same spiritual force that has bonded the people to their land. And if we wrench ourselves away, if we wrench anybody away we will lose so much....

In resolving the problem of national administrative structure it is essential to heed the opinion of even peoples who are maybe only a few hundred strong. Mighty oaks can grow from little acorns. And we must remember that this is not only Russia's inheritance. It is the inheritance of the entire world, all human civilization. I would therefore suggest that approaches to the resolution of nationality problems should be sought not only from the economic, national economic, or political viewpoint but first and foremost from the cultural viewpoint.

Fedor Shelov-Kovedyayev:

I believe that it is very important to realize that peoples' rights are a part of human rights. They have undisputed priority, and it is necessary to act on the basis of precisely this premise, including when organizing our state affairs. But there is what I see as as profound delusion that a given people's rights can be adequately protected only if they have a given degree of statehood and self-government. An even more harmful delusion is that a people's rights can be adequately defended by only a person of the same nationality....

Polozkov Meets With Party, Labor Veterans

PM1707123191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by V. Markov: "Meeting with Veterans"]

[Text] I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, has received a group of party and labor veterans at their request.

It was pointed out at the meeting that the social trends, economic interests, and political forces brought to life by perestroyka and democratization are ambiguous and contradictory and that some do not promote real social progress but even act destructively. Phenomena of acute confrontation have emerged in society—which is exacerbating the drop in discipline and morality and preparing the ground for growing anarchy and crime.

The veterans are concerned about the attacks of right-wing radicals, who call themselves "democrats," on socialism, the system of soviets, and on the working people's social gains. It is necessary to show the possible consequences of privatization through the example of other countries, but they propose that we accelerate it. People must know where they are going or, rather, where they are being dragged.

I.K. Polozkov answered the veterans' questions and expressed his views on ways to surmount the crisis in society and in the party.

Leningrad Communist Leader on CPSU Disputes

OW1807042891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Wednesday the leader of Leningrad's communists Boris Gidaspov gave a press conference in connection with disputes launched in the CPSU as to the need to convene an emergency party congress to adopt a new program and elect a new party leaership. Outlining his views B. Gidaspov said that he stands for convening such a congress in October-November, but not for dismissing the party's general secretary, since now it's not the time for replacing him. According to him, what is needed now is a new program for the CPSU designed to protect the ordinary people.

Gidaspov described the Bolshevist platform movement within the CPSU as an extreme and therefore unacceptable trend.

When asked by IF's [INTERFAX's] corresponent about his attitude to the call of the leaders of several regional party committees in Siberia and "Communists for Democracy" for dismissing the first secretary of Russia's Communist party Ivan Polozkov at the next plenum, Boris Gidaspov pointed to the need to bring new men to the party leadership and raise the popularity of Russia's Communist party.

According to B. Gidaspov, it's essential to let Polozkov leave his post quietly and without unnecessary noise.

As for the initiators of the Movement for Democratic Reforms, B. Gidaspov described them as former partocrats who formed the country's policy. 90

of their policy statement is a carbon copy of resolutions adopted by the 28th CPSU congress, he said.

According to B. Gidaspov, the process of reforms in the country is just "a replacement of Marxism by pure Darwinism, when the rich devour the poor."

Sobchak Overrules Soviet on Joint Patrols Issue

PM1707112791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[RIA report: "Patrols Come Out"]

[Text] According to the Leningrad Oblast and City Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Main Administration, joint patrols resumed on the city streets 16 July, a decision adopted by Leningrad's mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak. The Internal Affairs Main Administration, which comes under the mayor's jurisdiction, also announced that the Leningrad Soviet Presidium's previous decision banning quasi-military patrols is illegal in law.

City Soviet Chiefs Back 'Reform Movement' Idea

PM1707132791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 91 p 1

[TASS report: "In Support of 'Democratic Reform Movement'"]

[Text] The chairmen of city soviets belonging to the Union of Russian Cities have expressed their support for the idea of creating a "Democratic Reform Movement" in a document distributed at the Extraordinary Fifth Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

The city leaders signed an appeal to city soviet deputies which notes, in part, that "the creation of new democratic structures is absolutely essential for organizing an election campaign in a civilized form and winning victory for democratic forces in future municipal elections."

"We consider," the document states, "that the statement by A. Volskiy, N. Petrakov, G. Popov, A. Rutskoy, A. Sobchak, I. Silayev, S. Shatalin, E. Shevardnadze, and A.

Yakovlev testifies to an objectively essential stage in the process of democratic transformations of Soviet society intended to unite all those who are prepared for cooperation and mutual understanding and align their activity and aspirations with the ideals of freedom and humanism and a rule-of-law and civil society."

Silayev Approves Free Economic Zone in Kuzbass

LD1707162991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0753 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jul (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, has signed a "statute on a free economic zone in the Kuzbass" (western Siberia). According to TRUD today it covers all enterprises in Kemerovo Oblast. It abolishes the tariff system, allows salaries to be paid in currency, sets up joint enterprises in the fields of banking and insurance and will set up free customs zones. Joint enterprises and people involved in foreign economic activity can now register at the oblast executive committee. It will set quotas for extracting and developing mineral resources.

Gidaspov Remarks on Gorbachev Post, Others

LD1707175791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Boris Gidaspov, member of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, held a press conference in Leningrad. Our correspondent Denis Guretskiy reports:

[Guretskiy] Answering a question on the need to hold an extraordinary party congress in order to adopt a new program for the CPSU and to reelect the party leadership, Gidaspov said that he is in favor of convening such a congress in October or November but not in favor of dismissing the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee since it is not the right time now for replacing him. We need a new program for the CPSU to protect ordinary people. Gidaspov described the Bolshevik Movement platform in the CPSU as an extreme, and therefore unacceptable, solution.

Speaking about the formative process of the Movement for Democratic Reform, Gidaspov described the founders as former partocrats who used to shape the state's policy. Gidaspov also said that 90 percent of their program statement is a copy of the resolutions of the 28th CPSU congress.

Gidaspov stressed the need to find new leaders for the Russian Communist Party and to enhance its popularity among the people. Within this context we should allow Polozkov to quit his post quietly and without much fuss, Gidaspov said. In his view, the process of reforms in the country is developing under the idea of replacing Marxism with pure Darwinism when the rich gobble up the the poor. To corroborate the pernicious nature of the newly imposed theory Gidaspov said that it is enough to cast a glance at Germany which is run not by the federal chancellor or the government but exclusively by industrial dynasties such as Messerschmitt who have already brought Germany to two world wars in this century but still remain at the helm.

Incidentally, Gidaspov will apparently have to answer for this statement to the FRG consulate general in Leningrad which has already expressed its displeasure.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev Arrives in Romania

LD1707131691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov]

[Excerpts] Bucharest, 16 Jul (TASS)—The establishment of close political, economic, and cultural ties with Romania as with other eastern European countries is an important direction in the activity of the current leadership of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. This was stated to a TASS correspondent today by Andrey Kozyrev, foreign minister of the Russian Federation, who arrived in the Romanian capital on a three-day working visit. A. Kozyrev noted that his arrival in Romania is the continuation of the dialogue begun in spring this year between B.N. Yeltsin and Romanian President I. Iliescu. [passage omitted]

A. Kozyrev stressed that the RSFSR leadership regards Russo-Romanian relations not as an alternative to Soviet-Romanian relations, but as part of the general efforts to strengthen ties between the two states. He commented that the main aim of the RSFSR Foreign Ministry delegation's stay in Romania is to prepare for a visit to this country by the Russian President B.N. Yeltsin planned for autumn this year, and during which a declaration on cooperation between the two republics is to be signed. [passage omitted]

Democratic Russia Resolution on Armenia, Treaty

OW1707052191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The parliamentary bloc "Democratic Russia" which, following the split at the congress of Russian people's deputies, has retained 4 factions: the "Democratic Russia" proper, deputies belonging to no party, the "Workers' Union" and "Communists for Democracy", adopted on Tuesday a resolution in connection with developments on the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia and the upcoming signing of union treaty. "Democratic Russia", the statement says, doesn't believe that it's possible to sign such a treaty if one of the warring sides is a signatory to it, since it would mean that Russia joins the war too.

The parliamentary bloc "Democratic Russia" thinks it necessary to make the following stipulations for the signing of a union treaty:

1. prior to this Azerbaijan and Armenia should sign an agreement concerning Nagorno-Karabakh;

2. the deportation of ethnic Armenians from their homes should be ceased, and all the hostages held by the two sides should be transferred to the central authorities;

3. the rights and security of non-indigenous, including Russian-speaking, population should be guaranteed;

4. a mechanism of control on the part of republics over the actions of central interior ministry troops should be devised for the purpose of ruling out their use in the efforts to settle ethnic conflicts, except disengagement of the conflicting sides.

Rutskoy To Form Breakaway Party

PM1707123591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by unnamed TASS correspondent: "With Appeal to Create New Party"]

[Text] The leaders of the intraparty movement "Communists for Democracy" in the CPSU headed by A.V. Rutskoy, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy and Russian vice president, have come out with an appeal to create a new party—the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia—organizationally dissociating themselves from the RSFSR Communist Party. A program statement distributed today among the participants in the extraordinary fifth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies says in particular that "perestroyka has begun to mark time since its real content has come into contradiction with the group interests of the party apparatus, which has failed to understand the essence of the historical moment of the breakdown of an era and the situation in which power is shifting to different structures elected by the people." "In struggling to retain its power the party apparatus has chosen the method of trivializing the ideas of perestroyka and opposing the state authorities' new course," the statement notes.

The authors of the document believe that "the communist movement itself has turned the apparatus into a movement for its own benefit." In their opinion the leadership of the Russian Communist Party is also defending "its own benefit." "We assess the present RSFSR Communist Party leadership as undemocratic and for that very reason shortsighted," the leaders of the movement say, urging that "democratic trends in the communist party be united into an organized force" and that "they organize themselves into a new Democratic Party of Communists of Russia."

A TASS correspondent was told at the organizational committee of the "Communists for Democracy" movement that the new party will join the recently created "Democratic Reform Movement," of which A.V. Rutskoy is an initiator. The constituent conference to create the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia will be held in the very near future.

Belorussia

Extra Powers to Government, Premier

PM1707110591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by Mikhail Shimanskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Belorussia: Additional Powers to the Government"]

[Text] Minsk—The Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted a law on granting additional powers to the republic Council of Ministers in 1991-1992.

The law aims to increase the efficiency of state administration during the period of transition to the market and the execution of the provisions of the republic anticrisis program. Now, in line with the adopted law, the Belorussian SSR Government establishes the property liability of enterprises, institutions, and organizations, as well as their leaders' material responsibility for unfounded refusal or reluctance to conclude economic contracts on delivering produce, goods, and so on.

Extensive rights have been granted to the head of the government. He can, within the confines of a fixed budget, introduce changes to the list of ministries and republic state committees, appoint or release members of the Belorussian SSR Government by agreement with the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, and remove officials from positions of responsibility in local soviet executive organs in the event of their violating Belorussian legislation.

Orsha, Trade Union Reach Agreement

LD1707094891 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 0300 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] After a long strike marathon, an agreement has been reached in Orsha between the executive committee of the town soviet of people's deputies and the town council of trade unions on the main directions of social protection of the population under the conditions of the market economy for 1991. It envisages to assign for development of the social sphere not less than 33 percent of investments; to bring to living conditions not less than 76,000 square meters, what is one and a half times more than now; to install 10,000 home telephones; and to improve the spheres of living, trade, and transport. The main objective is to prevent privatization of enterprizes without consent of the trade unions and to set up training of workers. The possibility of moving some families from the town to the countryside is envisaged. An agreement on that has alrady been reached with the nearest agriculutral regions. There are all in all 30 points in the agreement. [words indistinct] another strike at the red fighter factory has begun.

Belorussian, Latvian Firms Sign Contract

LD1707181791 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 1300 GMT 14 Jul 91

[Text] Latvian is now heard at Zhlobin construction sites. The Center from Riga firm signed a contract with the Belorussian metallurgical works for constructing housing and a number of industrial buildings. They will work on a watch method [vakhtovyy metod] and this year plan to spend not less than 8 million Roubles. The Riga workers will build several monolithic, multistory buildings, using their own technology. In return, the Baltic partners will receive Belorussian metal for the Latvian construction industry.

Belorussia, Moldova Establish Economic Agreement

LD1707194191 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 0300 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Moldovan President Mircha Snegur received Vyacheslav Kebich, chairman of Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, who is there on a working visit, reports MOLDOVA-PRESS and BELTA. He spoke of the need for the two republics to sign an interstate agreement on friendship and cooperation. Within the framework of this agreement, stressed Mircha Snegur, the business people of Moldova and Belorussia, proceeding from mutual interests, will be able to establish economic, scientific, and cultural links. An agreement was reached at the meeting on detailed work on an intergovernmental economic agreement between Moldova and Belorussia.

Ukraine

Export of Agricultural Produce Banned

LD1707220291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] The Ukraine Government has established measures for protecting this year's harvest against being bought up by univited representatives of other republics. The programs can be theoretically divided into measures for stimulating farmers to hand over the produce to the republic's granary and mesures for protecting grain, vegetables, and meat products produced in the republic against dealers. This problem has become especially acute since 1 July when the republic abolished sales for coupons and swarms of profiteers rushed to the Ukraine. Exporting agricultural produce from the Ukraine has been banned altogether during the period that the state order is being met. All operations at the exchange which are related to exporting foodstuffs have been frozen.

Ukraine Communist Party Organizations Abolished

LD1707032191 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Over the last 18 months, six primary organizations of the Communist Party of Ukraine have been abolished in Samarskiy rayon of Dnepropetrovsk. At the recent plenum of the rayon party committee, concern was evident that the CPSU may transform from a party of workers into a party of engineers and technicians.

Kravchuk Speaks at Independence Celebrations

PM1707141091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent S. Tsikora: "Ukraine: Independence Day"]

[Text] "For the third time—after Bogdan Khmelnitskiy and the 1917 revolution—history has given the Ukraine the opportunity to renew its statehood, and we will not waste this opportunity."

So said L. Kravchuk, chairman of the [Ukrainian] Supreme Soviet, from the rostrum of a ceremonial meeting in Kiev to mark the first anniversary of the adoption of the republic's Declaration on State Sovereignty. Despite the event's official status, many people noted that the red and blue state flag of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] was absent from the hall where it was held. The stage was decked only with the official emblem, while the auditorium was dominated by a huge 7-meter blue and yellow national flag.

These details of the first Independence Day celebration could be disregarded were it not for the fact that the idea of creating a sovereign Ukraine and the revival of the people's national self-awareness have today become the most important factor in the republic's political life. Unreserved support for this idea has been declared not only by democrats and all the new political parties, organizations, and movements. "We are all working for sovereignty," S. Gurenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, stated in a republic newspaper.

The legal backing for the sovereignty idea is strengthening every day. Analyzing the year that has elapsed since the adoption of the republic's Declaration on State Sovereignty, L. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, said that parliament has adopted 220 legal acts, including 46 laws, relating to the constitutional foundations of Ukrainian statehood. They include such fundamental documents as the law on economic autonomy of the Ukrainian SSR, the resolution on transferring to the republic's jurisdiction state enterprises and organizations under Union jurisdiction that are located on Ukrainian territory, amendments to the Ukrainian SSR Constitution on the supremacy of republic laws over Union laws on its territory, the creation of a national bank...

So might the Ukraine not join the Union? Parliament has postponed the examination of this question to the fall, taking time to analyze the draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States from the viewpoint of the compatibility of its provisions with the Ukrainian Declaration on State Sovereignty and the concept of the new Ukrainian SSR Constitution. The first discussion of these questions in the republic parliament showed that on signing the Union treaty the Ukraine will apparently delegate a very restricted range of powers to the center.

But the complex question of the Union Treaty, like the election of the first president of the Ukraine, has been postponed to fall and the beginning of winter. Today, 16 July, is an official holiday throughout Ukrainian territory—the republic is celebrating Independence Day for the first time.

Moldova

Trade, Industry Chamber Expands Activity

LD1707174291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0539 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Summary] Kishinev, 16 July (TASS)—The Moldovan trade and industry chamber has significantly expanded its activities, according to the MOLDOVA-PRESS agency. This year it established cooperation with the regional chambers of France, China, Italy, Bulgaria, and Poland and currently negotiations are underway with Germany, Austria, Hungary, India, and Morocco. Vasiliy Gandrabuora, chairman of the presidium of the trade and industry chamber, said in an interview with MOLDOVA-PRESS correspondents that the main task for the chamber at present is to train future experts. In all, 350 republican enterprises are cooperating with foreign countries. The chamber has already set up business schools in Moldovan towns and regions and it plans to set up an advertising agency which will familiarize foreign partners with Moldova's achievements in science, industry and agriculture.

Former Premier Druk on Differences With Snegur

OW1807065391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The former Moldavian Prime-Minister Mircea Druk has said in an interview with the Romanian newspaper 22 that they did not get along with the Moldavian President Mircea Snegur from the very start.

According to Druk, they disagreed on personnel policy.

"For me professional competence and loyalty to the national cause, he said, mattered more than loyalty to the leader which the president values above everything." [quotation marks as received]

Mircea Druk resigned after the scandal caused by his past connection with the KGB.

Georgia

Labor Minister Gugushvili on Unemployment Policy

AU1607171391 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 19 Jun 91 p 1,2

[Interview with Tamaz Gugushvili, minister of labor, social protection, and demography by Spartak Grachev; place and date not given]

[Text] The other day, my neighbor returned from work upset and glumly joked: "Well, you can congratulate me. I am on holiday.... There are problems with deliveries so there is no work. We have been sent home; for how long—no one knows. Perhaps permanently.... How are we going to live...?"

Indeed, she is alone and has two children to cope with; she has good reason to despair. It is not too bad if the problem with work is a temporary one....

An unexpected misfortune has slowly and imperceptibly crept up on us, namely, unemployment. In our consciousness that has been battered by slogans and official communist phraseology, the idea has firlmy taken root that unemployment can only exist abroad whereas, in our country that is on the path toward a "shining future," everyone is guaranteed the right to work (read: the right to a wage, be it miserely, irrespective of how one labors).

However, it seems that we are now returning to common sense: One should be paid (and well!) only for working and not for appearing to work while those who have got used to goofing off and living as parasites will have to remain outside the factory gates. In this sense, unemployment is a blessing. However, what is going to happen to those who have lost their job as a result of staff cuts brought about by new technology and management restructuring and, finally, as a result of changes in the economic situation and public demand in one or another profession?

Many people have recently expressed their concern in letters to the editorial office and want to know to what extent a person who is laid off will be protected. What do those in the Ministry of Labor, Social Protection, and Demography of the Republic of Georgia think about this? It is on this subject that we spoke to the minister, Tamaz Gugushvili.

[Grachev] Batono [Georgian polite form of address] Tamaz, many rumors, one worse than the other, are being spread throughout our towns and villages. Can you give an objective forecast regarding employment in the republic for this year and next? On the basis of preliminary data, how many people will find themselves unemployed?

[Gugushvili] We will not hide the fact that the situation is serious. With the transfer to market relations in the republic, as early as this year a considerable number of able-bodied citizens—approximately 3-3.5 percent overall—will be classified as unemployed. Furthermore, according to all our data, this trend will worsen; on the basis of preliminary forecasts, the army of unemployed could amount to 100,000-150,000 in 1992. However, according to our calculations, this will be the peak figure as, thereafter, with the development of privatization and an expansion of the services sphere, the number of new jobs will exceed the sum total of workers made redundant and the number of persons entering the job market.

[Grachev] Is the republic's state employment service prepared for such a serious situation? Where can a person who has lost his job apply? Are the jobless being registered? Are there lists of job vacancies? Are there ways of finding out the state of the labor market?

[Gugushvili] In accordance with the Republic of Georgia Government Resolution of 15 April 1991 on the Structure and Basic Functions of the Ministry of Labor, Social Protection, and Demography of the Republic of Georgia, a state employment exchange has been created that incorporates a republican employment exchange and 10 regional employment exchanges located in Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Batumi, Sukhumi, Gori, Rustavi, Telavi, Poti, Akhaltsikhe, and Zugdidi. The regional employment exchanges embrace all the towns and regions of the republic and there will be fully empowered inspectors in every region. There are presently approximately 300 people employed in the state employment exchange. It is envisaged in the near future to expand the staff to 1,200 persons, a figure that corresponds to the norms established in highly developed countries.

Enterprises and organizations are to supply the employment exchange with monthly information concerning vacancies and all persons hired or laid off. This information will be fed into personal computers and, in this way, all questions connected with the registration of those unemployed, job placement, and also job vacancies will be concentrated in an information bank. Incidentally, this data will be published in monthly information bulletins.

[Grachev] How much will the unemployment benefit amount to? How will it be allocated and, finally, will the unemployed be compensated for price increases?

[Gugushvili] In accordance with the bill on the employment of the population, we envisage setting up an employment fund attached to our ministry into which will accumulate compulsory deductions from enterprises and organizations, voluntary donations from republican and foreign enterprises, and also budget allocations. It must be emphasized that the Government of the Republic of Georgia intends to give the employment fund a budget allocation of approximately 20 million rubles [R], a figure which amounts to three percent of the wage fund of budget organizations for three quarters of the current year. Thereafter, this amount will be determined according to the real needs of the employment fund.

[Grachev] What help can a person who has lost his job count on?

[Gugushvili] First, he will receive benefit for a period of 12 months following his registration at the employment exchange. Furthermore, during the first three months, the amount of benefit will be equivalent to his average monthly wage at his last place of work (but no more than five times the subsistence wage established in the republic). Then, during the fourth to the sixth month, the benefit will amount to 70 percent of his previous average monthly wage (but no more than three times the subsistence wage). If a person cannot find a job in the course of seven to nine months, he will receive 50 percent of his average wage (but no more than twice the subsistence wage) and, during the last three months, he will receive benefit equivalent to the subsistence wage established in the republic. An unemployed person who has children or other family members to support will receive 25 percent more for each dependent but no more than the average wage calculated during the last three months at his previous place of work. In the event that the unemployed person cannot find a job during this period, when he is no longer eligible for benefit, he will receive material assistance amounting to 50 percent of the subsistence wage.

For those who have completed secondary school and have registered as unemployed at the employment exchange, the amount of benefit to be allocated will be equivalent to the subsistence wage established in the republic.

In addition to receiving unemployment benefit, each registered unemployed person will receive R50 a month in connection with the reorganization of retail prices.

It is necessary to explain here that presently the subsistence wage and the minimum wage are the same (R70). In reality, the subsistence wage should be considerably higher. The necessary calculations are being made in our ministry to determine the amount of the subsistence wage and, in the near future, the appropriate resolution will be adopted by the republic's Government in connection with this question.

In addition, work is also going on to determine the minimum average wage. Taking into account compensation for price increases, it already amounts to R130 a month. However, in the future, there should be a differentiation in the minimum wage according to sectors and its average amount should exceed the subsistence wage by a factor of two to 2.5. This is dictated by common sense and the experience of the developed countries. Thus, for example, in France, the subsistence wage is 2,000 francs [Fr] a month while the average minimum wage is Fr5,300.

[Grachev] Do enterprises bear any kind of responsibility for the people that they have made redundant? What kind of protection can the latter count on?

[Gugushvili] In accordance with existing legislation, if a worker is laid off due to staff cuts or the reorganization or closure of an enterprise, he is to be given no less than two months notice. During this time, the enterprise or parent organization should find him work corresponding to his specialization either in one of its branches or at a neighboring enterprise.

I would like to direct your attention to one significant new thing. If a worker, on being laid off, formerly received compensation from the same enterprise, he now receives it from the employment exchange.

[Grachev] Life shows us that those most vulnerable in the face of unemployment are, as a rule, the elderly, invalids, and also young people, and women. Others who frequently find themselves in a difficult position are the representatives of the creative and technical intelligentsia, particularly those approaching retirement age. Are any special quotas or flexible forms of employment (a short working day or week and so forth) envisaged for them?

[Gugushvili] Yes. A governmental draft resolution stipulates that enterprises are obliged to have a specific reserve of jobs for the socially unprotected strata of the population including invalids, women, young persons, and so forth; they can be employed on a part-time basis. If an enterprise refuses to provide such jobs, it will have to pay a significant fine that will go into the employment fund. The employment agency can use these resources to create small enterprises at which such categories of the population may be employed.

Of course, if an agency is unable to offer a person work that corresponds to his specialization, it can direct him to one of the vocational schools for retraining. At the same time, in accordance with the bill on the employment of the population, unemployed persons with dependents will be given a grant equivalent to 80 percent of their average wage at their last place of work while those without dependents will receive 50 percent of their average monthly wage but no less than the subsistence wage established in the republic. For first-time job seekers, the size of the grant will be no lower than the subsistence wage.

One would like to hope that, in the next 10-15 years, the demand for jobs in the republic will be balanced by the labor resources available and that we will remove the serious disproportions that have resulted from the incorrect policy implemented in the sphere of the professional training of workers when we had a plethora of specialists in certain fields and a considerable dearth of them in other areas. Therefore, each worker should psychologically prepare himself for the possibility that he will have to change his specialization depending upon the socioeconomic needs of the market economy.

Gamsakhurdia, Mutalibov Comment on Pact

PM1707104791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 91 p 2

[David Ninua report: "Good-Neighborliness Without Intermediaries"]

[Text] Tbilisi—"Georgia will continue to have good relations and to conclude treaties with republics currently in the Soviet Union, irrespective of whether or not they sign the Union Treaty," President Zviad Gamsakhurdia of the Republic of Georgia told journalists.

This conversation with journalists took place after a meeting between the presidents of Azerbaijan and Georgia, who signed a friendship and good-neighborliness treaty in which the two sides recognize the state sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighboring republics and assert the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of the parties [subyekty] to this treaty.

As President Ayaz Mutalibov of the Azerbaijani Republic stated, this treaty is of historic significance and is a guarantee of good-neighborliness.

A few hours later the presidents of the two republics participated in a news conference where the predominant questions concerned future economic and cultural cooperation between Georgia and Azerbaijan. But maybe everybody there was worried about the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. As is already known, Zviad Gamsakhurdia has proposed to his Azerbaijani and Armenian counterparts that they meet on Georgian territory to discuss questions linked with a solution to this protracted conflict. As was noted at the news conference, the center, to put it mildly, was not overjoyed at this course of events since it could lose its bargaining card as a peacemaker in resolving a question which is of such importance from many aspects, including the political. On this occasion the Georgian and Azerbaijani presidents reiterated their readiness to hold talks at a Transcaucasus level.

Armenia

Official Criticizes Azerbaijani 'Propaganda'

OW1807043091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a briefing on Tuesday evening the acting Armenian Interior Minister Ashot Manucharian said that the overwhelming majority of Azerbaijanis are absolutely unaware of the actual state of affairs in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Shaumian region of Azerbaijan. He placed the blame on the official propaganda of Azerbaijan which is conducted by government and party agencies in the neighbouring republic. "They even don't know, he said, that we have proposed versions of solving the problem acceptable for them, too". [quotation marks as received] He disclosed that a month ago an understanding was reached on regular meetings between the leaders of law-enforcement agencies in Yerevan and Baku, on drafting programs for the peaceful coexistence of the two peoples.

Manucharian was supposed to appear on Azerbaijani television and his Azerbaijani counterpart on Armenian television. "However, the Azerbaijani side only spoke of agreement with all the proposals, but acted extremely arrogantly evidently feeling the backing of the Army", the Armenian official thought. In his opinion such power could not be stable.

Human Rights Commission Travels to NKAO

OW1807042991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] More than 10,000 Armenians have been forcibly deported from Nagorno-Karabakh [Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] since the end of April. This was announced on July 17 at a press conference in Moscow by the members of an expert commission which recently visited the area. The commission is headed by the speaker of the British House of Lords, Baroness Caroline Cox. The commission was set up by a decision of the 1st International Andrei Sakharov Congress, entitled "Peace, Progress and Human Rights". The commission visited Nagorno-Karabakh for the first time in May 30-June 1 1991.

"We were in Stepanakert and nearby villages for the course of three days", said Baroness Cox. "We studied the situation in the region and came to the conclusion that if the deportations are continued, further armed conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan is unavoidable."

In a statement signed by the members of the expert commission, four potential sources of further conflict are named: forced deportation, unfounded arrests and detention, persecution of the civilian population and the actions of the Azerbaijan special police force. According to Baroness Cox, the Azerbaijani authorities, right up to the president, justify the deportations by saying that the people are moving voluntarily. "We received quite different information", she said, "murders, assaults and damage to property are all taking place".

Baroness Cox drew attention to the appalling condition in which detainees were being held in Azerbaijani prisons. "They are not allowed contact with relatives or lawyers, they are subject to assault and are always thirsty as they are not given water and are fed with over-salted food".

Answering a question of INTERFAX's correspondent concerning the position which, in the commission's view, should be adopted in this situation, Lord Pearson, of the British Upper House, said that the center should not support either side.

Radio Rossii Reports Trip

LD1707194991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 17 Jul 91

[Text] Representatives of the International Sakharov Congress for the Protection of Human Rights have visited Baku. Azer Khalilov has the details.

[Khalilov] The group was led by member of the British House of Lords Baroness Cox. After a brief meeting with the republic's president, the delegation set off for Nagorno-Karabakh. There the representatives of the Human Rights Congress had meetings with Armenians and Azerbaijanis and visited the Azerbaijani village of Karadagly where at the end of June six residents were burned alive. On returning to Baku, part of the delegation flew to Armenia on a plane sent specially from Yerevan. Then, in accordance with an agreement, the delegation joined up again in Nagorno-Karabakh where it continued its familiarization with the situation.

Yesterday, the congress delegation had a meeting at the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Republic. The groups head, Baroness Cox, noted that she was altogether satisfied with the real opportunity given them to familiarize themselves with the Karabakh situation. The guests admitted that the information which they directly obtained in the conflict zone has signifcantly altered their ideas about the causes of the conflict. Now, in their words, they have sufficiently objective information about the Karabakh situation.

The members of the Human Rights Congress believe that they are now less interested in matters of the conflict and its sources than in what (?the sides see as) the political ways out of the crisis. I think that the representatives of the West have compiled their view and will publicize their impressions. However, regardless of how they view the parties, one is impressed by the mere fact that by the form of their visit, the representatives of the Sakharov Congress stressed their recognition of Azerbaijan's jurisdiction over the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Perhaps it would be worthwhile for our amateurish armchair politicians, who verbally pontificate about rights and sovereignty while in practice see the republics merely as provinces, and who prefer going to Nagorno-Karabakh only via Yerevan, to learn something from the West about the art of diplomacy and (?statehood).

Rights Abuses Described

LD1707221991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 17 Jul 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Today at last we received objective information about what is taking place in Nagorno-Karabakh these days. After great difficulties and long negotiations, international observers have visited the region.

[Correspondent V. Lenskiy] A news conference in Moscow today was devoted to the unlawful actions taking place in Nagorno-Karabakh. Independent experts from the Sakharov Congress from the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and the USSR returned from Stepanakert just a short time ago. In their view, human rights abuses have reached disastrous proportions in Nagorno-Karabakh. The forced deportation of Armenians is continuing. The villages they leave are being populated by Azeris, refugees from Armenia. According to the commission's data, over the last two months alone their number has exceeded 120,000.

The Azerbaijan OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] and Internal Affairs Ministry represent great danger. Unjustified arrests have become normal in Nagorno-Karabakh. Members of the Sakharov Congress said that the five Armenians who had been with them in the same airplane had been arrested immediately after arriving in Stepanakert, without any explanations. When British Baroness Cox, head of the delegation of experts, tried to intercede, she was rudely pushed aside by OMON members.

The way those detained are treated also causes grave alarm. Eleven Armenian militiamen who were freed recently from the Stepanakert prison said they had been tortured by being deprived of drinking water.

Experts recommended that OMON units should be immediately withdrawn from Nagorno-Karabakh and disbanded and that arrests and deportations should be halted.

Azerbaijan

President Mutalibov on Relations With Armenia

LD1807084191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 18 Jul 91

[Text] The Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov has said the key condition for normalizing relations with Armenia is ending Armenian interference in Azerbaijani affairs.

As Mutalibov said at a meeting with reporters, his idea was very simple. Nagorno-Karabakh is a separate part of Azerbaijan, but incorporated in its political and economic structure, while the Armenians and Azerbaijanis living there are citizens of Azerbaijan.

We, Mutalibov said, should return to the situation that existed prior to the events started in Karabakh by separatists in 1988.

Meanwhile tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh have grown again in recent days. There have been reports of new armed clashes. The Azerbaijani and Armenian sides, however, are giving different interpretations of the events.

Second Presidential Candidate Nominated

LD1807081191 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 18 Jul 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku July 18 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijani Social Democratic group nominated Zardusht Alizade, 45, editor of its publication—the ISTIGLAL (INDEPENDENCE) newspaper—as candidate for the post of president of Azerbaijan, a spokesman for the Central Electoral Commission told journalists today.

Before Zardusht Alizade emerged as an alternative candidate, the incumbent Azerbaijani president, the republican Communist leader Ayaz Mutalibov, 53, was the only presidential candidate. He was nominated by 60 labour collectives of enterprises and institutions, the Central Electoral Commission reports. His candidature was approved and supported at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Control and Auditing Commission of the Azerbaijani Communist Party. The nomination will be over in a week, and the presidential elections, the first ever in that republic, will take place on September 8. In accordance with the law adopted by the Azerbaijani parliament, they will be held by direct secret ballot. The law also stipulates that a president should be no younger than 35 and no older than 65, and should have lived in Azerbaijan for no less than five years.

Kyrgyzstan

'Serious Changes' to Economic Policy Planned

LD1707172591 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 17 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek July 17 TASS—The draft of a new economic programme which will make serious changes in Kyrgyzia's economic policy was published in the local press today.

Making the draft public, Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev noted that the main item of the draft is the wide-ranging privatisation of state property. According to preliminary estimates, privatisation will affect the interests of nearly 40,000 people.

The value of installations to come under the privatisation plan tops 800 million roubles. Trade, services, public catering establishments, small factories and a section of the transport industry will be the first to be privatised over the next few months.

According to the president, it would be good "to auction or hand over enterprises under construction to work collectives so that new owners could complete construction with their own funds.

"This would help put into circulation about 1,500 million roubles frozen in unfinished construction."

The programme provides for expanding horizontal economic relations with union republics and establishing joint ventures with them. This will considerably consolidate the economic basis of a renewed USSR, Akayev stressed.

Much attention is given to accelerating land reform. The document emphasises that it is necessary now "to give land to peasants, to enlarge their personal plots of land and to help them organise their farms".

The programme gives a lot of space to stepping up the republic's foreign economic activities. Kyrgyzia has adopted new laws to attract foreign investments that provide legal and economic guarantees for foreign businessmen.

The programme expresses readiness to cooperate with businessmen from any country.

The new economic programme provides social protection measures for Kyrgyz residents, including the creation of new jobs and retraining of personnel. The programme also focuses on the financial revitalisation of the Kyrgyz banking system.

Tajikistan

Islamic Revival Threatening Republic Government

PM1707142191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 91 p 2

[U. Babakhanov report: "Green Tea in the 'Red Tea Room'. Will the Victors in the Struggle Between Tajik Communists and Democrats Be... the Islamic Radicals?"]

[Text] Dushanbe—Two buildings stand almost next to one another in Dushanbe. Two symbols of two world outlooks, of two eras. The Islamic Institute and the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Sociopolitical Center. The distance between them is 100 meters. A gulf.

Only quite recently it seemed: Just a bit longer and things will be "over and done with forever" with Islam. We just have to build one more "red chaykhana [tea-drinking establishment in Central Asia]," hold one more atheistic conversation in the village, expel from the CPSU yet another party member for burying his parents according to Islamic customs....

Seventy years of atheist extremism, it might have seemed, had been crowned with success. But now an expedition of academics, who studied Tajikistan's northern rayons in the mid-eighties, have discovered a startling picture: In individual villages the number of active underground mosques corresponds to the norms under the Kokand Khanate in the middle of the 19th century!

People are cursing perestroyka and its initiators more and more in the East today. But the Muslims of Tajikistan are praying for it. Chief Qadi Hajji Akbar Turadzhonzoda, the head of the republic's official clergy, misses no opportunity to praise Gorbachev and his policies to the skies. The explanation is simple: The new thinking has finally given the followers of Muhammad equal rights with the worshippers of Marx. Now Muslims too have been granted the opportunity to print literature, set up their own "political enlightenment establishments"—mosques and medreses [Muslim schools]—and elect deputies to parliament... This opportunity has naturally been exploited, and the green cupolas of true believers have begun to rise in dangerous proximity to the red banners of Communists. Islam has gathered strength slowly, but irreversibly. Outwardly this was hardly noticed—the Soviet and spiritual authorities for the time being did not intersect, as if existing in different dimensions.

The "short circuit" occurred unexpectedly in February last year, in the days of the Dushanbe events. Various people came out to address the crowd of many thousands in the square in those days. And the square accurately recorded the popularity enjoyed by each of them. They spared neither Central Committee secretaries nor members of the government; they heckled representatives of the national intelligentsia—a famous philosopher, a democrat journalist, and a poet. And only before the man in the turban did the square calm down reverentially and fall to its knees of its own accord. "Allah Akbar!" (Allah is great)—thousands of people sighed at once. The words of the prayer, amplified many times over by the loudspeakers and cooling the hot heads, echoed through the wintry town. The imams called people to reason and piety, patience and tolerance, peace and concord. And their words were effective—the people dispersed.

Truly, Allah is great...

"Politics are filth!" A. Turadzhonzoda would say in a speech later, stressing his unwillingness to get involved in the affairs of state. The official qadis were entirely satisfied with unlimited power over people's minds and souls. But the genie has now been let out of the bottle, and a different Islam has come to the fore—an unofficial Islam.

In the fall of last year a meteor soared across the Tajik political horizon like a bright star—the Islamic Revival Party announced its intention to register. The republic Supreme Soviet reacted energetically—to ban the party. Qadi representatives also condemned attempts to create an Islamic party as contravening the Koran.

Sooner or later, the 20th century—the century of the "Islamic renaissance"—forced all the ruling regimes in the East to determine their stance toward Islam. Back in 1928, Ataturk's Turkey enshrined the principle of secularism—the secular development of the state following a ban on the exploitation of Islam for political purposes—into its constitution as a fundamental principle.

Our consciousness, that has grown so freedom-loving and democratic of late, cannot comprehend: How is it possible to go against the will of the majority of the people? The answer to this question can be seen in modern Algeria: A country on the brink of civil war. The cause is the activity of Islamic Salvation Front fundamentalists.

Shah Reza Pahlavi tried to lead Iran along the path of Western modernization. But the shah's "white revolution" was replaced by an Islamic revolution. What will come in the place of our "red revolution"?

For Tajikistan this is a far from abstract question. It is obvious to many people today that the Islamic factor is destined to play a major role in the life of the republic. The only question is how this process will proceed: "From below" or "from above." In the first instance the "Iranian scenario" is the most probable: Accusations of apostasy against the ruling regime and the organization of a mass movement to establish an Islamic state. The second option is a limited "Islamization from above," controlled by the authorities.

The republic leadership, it seems, has already made its choice. More than 70 mosques, hundreds of prayer houses, and an Islamic institute have been built in Tajikistan recently; religious holidays have been declared nonworking days.

This policy is being criticized from various sides. Supporters of orthodox Islam charge the leadership with encroaching on democratic freedoms by banning the Islamic party. The fundamentalist wing of the Tajik Communist Party criticizes the president—its own first secretary—for indulging the mullahs: Is it fitting for the Communists' leader to visit the mosque and see off pilgrims!

The comrades have not profited by the lessons of February...

The rural population of Tajikistan constitutes about 70 percent of the total population. Whom will the young unemployed inhabitants of the villages support if, God forbid, there should be a second "February"? The raykom [rayon party committee] secretary, the scholar-democrat from the academy, or the village mullah...? And the republic's democratic forces—what position do they take? Just as befits democrats, they furiously criticize the CPSU and demand the removal of Communists from power. "Energetic, progressive-thinking people should finally come to the republic's leadership, like in Russia or Estonia," they say. A praiseworthy wish, who would argue...

The only point being that Tajikistan is neither Estonia nor Russia. The strong religious feelings of the population and the weakness of the democratic movement, the lowest standard of living in the country, and the distorted, one-sided economy are today's realities, and do not, unfortunately, enable one to make an optimistic forecast. Given such a development of events, Tajikistan is, I fear, threatened with the fate of becoming a poor and warlike Islamic republic, periodically wracked by internecine strife and palace coups. Rule by the party will be replaced by rule by the mullahs. Who finds this a happy prospect?

The conclusion, in my opinion, is unambiguous: The struggle between Communists and democrats is an impermissible luxury for Tajikistan. If not today, then tomorrow the barricades will most probably run between the supporters of the secular state and the champions of the Islamic path of development. And it would be no bad thing for the powers-that-be to assimilate the experience of the foreign East: The fewer opportunities there are in the state for activity by the legal democratic opposition, the more powerful are the Muslim radicals in that state.